

The University of Chicago

PANHELLENISM IN ARISTOPHANES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1935


By

WILLIAM MEREDITH HUGILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936

PANHELLENISM
IN ARISTOPHANES

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY, NEW YORK; THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY
PRESS, LONDON; THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,
FUKUOKA, SENDAI; THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LIMITED, SHANGHAI

The University of Chicago

PANHELLENISM IN ARISTOPHANES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1935

By
WILLIAM MEREDITH HUGILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936

COPYRIGHT 1936 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1936



PREFACE

In the most unambiguous and positive manner, Aristophanes himself gave expression in his plays to a claim and to a conviction which jointly constitute the justification for this study. At the beginning of his career in our earliest extant play, the Acharnians,¹ he claimed credit for giving good counsel to the city in practical politics. This declaration was called forth by way of protest against the allegations of Cleon who had accused the poet before the senate of lèse majesté on the basis of the Babylonians produced the year before.² In his last great play, the Frogs,³ he argued at great length his conviction that literature had a moral and didactic purpose. Both the claim and the conviction are implicit in all the comedies⁴ which Aristophanes wrote during the Peloponnesian War. In some plays they are recognized chiefly by inference or expressed in casual references. They become most conspicuous in those plays whose composition coincided in time with a phase of the war which was critical for Athens. In other words, the poet allowed himself to become the more plain spoken, the greater he conceived to be the need of his advice. Hence it is that the most complete expression of the political views which he advocated occurs in the Lysistrata, which was written in the shadow of the defeat and destruction of the Sicilian Expedition, when party strife at Athens was eclipsed for

¹Ach. 500, 501, 633, 641-45, 655, 661-62. ²Ach. 377-82.

³Ran. 391 ff., 686-87, 1009 ff., 1487, 1501, 1530.

⁴E.g., Eq. 510; Nub. 518-19; Vesp. 1023 ff.; Pax 736 ff., 773-74; Lys. 639, 1046. Cf. A. Couat, Aristophane et l'ancienne comédie attique (3d ed.; Paris, 1902), pp. 64-65.

a brief time by a general desire to act for the common good and to listen to the counsels of wisdom whencesoever derived.

The term Panhellenism employed throughout this discussion is not intended to convey any esoteric implication, nor to suggest that Aristophanes subscribed to any special political formula promulgated by any organized political group. He was not a doctrinaire in the narrow sense of the word. Obviously he was not a supporter of the democratic-imperialist government, which was the principal object of his attacks, nor, on the other hand, were his attacks motivated by factious sympathy with reactionary and revolutionary opposition to that government as has sometimes been supposed. In the present review of his criticism, the conclusion has been reached that he was opposed not to the democratic form, but to the predatory policy of the government, and that his motives were much more patriotic than partisan.

As a peace propagandist, Aristophanes was hostile to a militarist government, but his hostility to militarism, so far from being prompted by any general theory of pacifism, was based upon observation and experience of the objective results of a particular war. His peace plays are devoted to a presentation of these results as he saw them, but the remarkable feature of the presentation is that it is concerned not with the effect of the war upon Athens alone, but upon Greece as a whole. Even where Athenian interests are the special subject of consideration, they are regarded as extending beyond the borders of Attica to the allies of Athens, and the interests of the latter are held to be identical with the true interests of Athens. It is because of this broader viewpoint that the patriotism of Aristophanes is seen to be as much Greek as Athenian, and his policy must be called Panhellenism rather than Nationalism.

The Aristophanic conception of Panhellenism was in sharp

contrast with the policy of Pericles and his successors both as it affected the Athenian and the Spartan alliance. The maintenance of the Athenian alliance and naval hegemony was desired as much by Aristophanes as by his opponents; the divergence between them is explained by the metamorphosis of that alliance from confederacy to empire. Imperialism, being incompatible with the Hellenic instinct for local autonomy, sowed the seeds of its own collapse by destroying the goodwill between Athens and her allies and demanding the enforced obedience of those whose co-operation had once been voluntary. By reversion from this coercive tendency, the fruits of which became increasingly apparent as the continuance of the war offered the allies more frequent opportunities to revolt, Aristophanes preferred the earlier constitution of the Delian League with its partnership of autonomous states, chiefly as a guarantee that the power of the alliance would not be used in a war of Greek against Greek, but only in the common cause of Greek against barbarian.

Neither did Aristophanes fail to realize that it was the menace of imperialism which had brought Athens into conflict with the Spartan alliance, a contest which he clearly perceived and boldly declared was fast accomplishing the ruin of all Hellas. He believed that the safety of Greece required that Athens should effect a modus vivendi with Sparta, and he could think of nothing better than the division of power to which they had agreed in 445. More than once he definitely refers to the salutary results of the Thirty Years' Truce, and somewhat less directly suggests a complementary arrangement by which the two great powers should share the hegemony of Greece, Athens securing the recognition of her naval supremacy from Sparta in return for renunciation of aggressive designs upon the Spartan land alliance.

Constructive criticism upon these two points of Athenian

foreign policy together with a lively consciousness and warning that the integrity of Greece was still vulnerable and exposed to the active threat of Persian gold, intrigue, and troops, constitute the main features of the Panhellenism of Aristophanes. The positive presentation of his position appears prominently in the Peace and in the Lysistrata, and these plays supply the key to the ubiquitous negative criticism of other plays. Anti-imperialism in Aristophanes is the negative side of Panhellenism, and should not be attributed to any preference for oligarchic institutions.

The present inquiry was begun as an examination of the various comedies in chronological order in an endeavor to trace the growth and development of Aristophanes' political creed, and the final form still bears the mark of the original plan. But it was soon discovered that the poet's views did not so much grow or develop from play to play, as only vary in the emphasis with which they were set forth, according as their author judged that the occasion was more or less suitable for their favorable reception. It was found that an allegorical passage in the Lysistrata contained a fairly complete synopsis of the poet's whole political faith, that this passage could be most effectively interpreted by close comparison with shorter scattered references in earlier plays of which it was only a fuller statement, and that it was merely confirmed and substantiated by certain more familiar and famous passages in the Frogs. The final form of exposition adopted, therefore, is a detailed discussion of the pertinent matter of the Lysistrata, in which the other comedies have been laid under heavy but incidental contribution to explain and illustrate a most significant but much misunderstood passage.

The argument is divided into two parts. The heart of the matter is dealt with in the second part in which is given a full discussion and interpretation of the allegory through which the

poet expressed his political policy. But however amorphous Old Attic Comedy may be, even in Aristophanes it is not possible to appreciate the whole meaning of a passage apart from its setting. In the Lysistrata, certainly, the tendency of the plot is in complete accord with the doctrine of the allegory, and affords it considerable support. In the first part of the argument the play has been analyzed to bring out those features of its atmosphere and structure which throw light upon the central thought and the passage under consideration. But no attempt has been made to give a consecutive narrative of the action of the drama. No synopsis would be full enough to mention all the brief utterances and minute details which furnish significant evidence for the present interpretation. To determine the validity of the argument reference must be had to the complete text.

Though all the plays of Aristophanes have been used without reserve to make this exposition of his political views complete, the writer believes that, as the consideration of the play as a whole, in its historical setting, both lends force to the allegory of the Lysistrata and clarity to our understanding of it, so it may be of value to analyze some of the other plays produced at other crises of the war to illustrate the steadfast loyalty with which Aristophanes adhered to his own solution of the troubles of Greece and to ascertain what justification was afforded for his solution in the changing political circumstances of the time. Accordingly, it is hoped that this study will be followed by subsequent articles dealing with topics of an allied nature, the occasion for which has been disclosed in the present investigation.

In the citation of lines from the text of Aristophanes, where no particular editor is indicated, the reference is always to the edition of Hall and Geldart in the Oxford Classical Texts series. Frequent reference has naturally been made to the valuable

commentaries of Blaydes, Rogers, and Van Leeuwen on all the plays, and to the annotated editions of particular plays by Kock, Merry, Starkie, Rennie, Neil, Sharpley, and Tucker, as indicated in the footnotes. Special attention has been paid to the edition of the Lysistrata by von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Scholia have been cited from the editions of Dindorf and Rutherford. It has not seemed to serve any useful purpose to include a register of the numerous passages cited from ancient authors, but a select bibliography has been appended of modern authorities whose work has been most commonly and most profitably consulted.

The writer finally avails himself of this opportunity to acknowledge his gratitude to Professor Robert J. Bonner of the University of Chicago who suggested the subject of the study and whose generous and invaluable criticism has always been at his disposal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Page
I. DRAMATIC SETTING OF THE STATEMENT OF POLICY: PANHELLENIC BEARING OF THE PLOT OF THE <u>LYSISTRATA</u> . . .	1
Didactic character of the play; Treatment of the <u>Probulus</u> ; General need for peace; Attack on military expenditure; Humanitarian appeal; Threefold program of Panhellenism; Common action; Censure of fratricidal strife; Reconciliation; Reminiscences of dual hegemony; Compromise; Dramatic counter-motive; Dramatic confession of duplicity; Illustrations of compromise; Dual character of the compromise; Panhellenic motive of the reconciliation dramatically reinforced; Attitude to trade	
II. <u>LYSISTRATA'S</u> POLITICAL ALLEGORY: THE POLICY ENUNCIATED .	39
A. The Allegory	39
B. Domestic Reform	40
Elimination of sycophants; Suppression of clubs; Identity of oligarchic conspirators; Artistic evidence for interpretation; Anticipation of the <u>Frogs</u> ; Attitude of Aristophanes towards admission of new citizens; Athenian tradition of franchise limitation; Aristophanes advocates enfranchisement of deserving resident aliens; Condition of enfranchisement	
C. Imperial Reform	67
Colonies of Athens defined; Athenian origin of the Ionians endorsed; Principle of local autonomy accepted; Theory of an <u>Einheitsstaat</u> considered; Effects of change in imperial fiscal policy; Evaluation of absentee citizenship and its privileges; No precedent for the <u>Einheitsstaat</u> theory; Plateaens; Samians; Euboeans; Definition of "woolflocks"; Immigration quota theory rejected; Revival of the federal system; Boeotian parallel; Mutual advantages of the federal system; Panhellenism versus imperialism; Appeal to Athenian self-interest; Aristophanes' ideal democracy; First among equals and all against the barbarian	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

PART I

DRAMATIC SETTING OF THE STATEMENT OF POLICY:

PANHELLENIC BEARING OF THE PLOT OF THE LYSISTRATA

The genius of Aristophanes, which expressed itself so largely in criticism and caricature of the politicians and politics of his time, was yet influenced by the fluctuating fortunes of the very objects of his criticism. The exuberance of beauty and imagination which overflows in the Birds, though it masks the most delicate satire of imperial ambition, doubtless owes its brilliant quality to the spirit of enthusiasm and exaltation in which the Sicilian Expedition was prepared and despatched. And when Neme-sis punished the proud city of the armada by the Spartan occupation of Deceleia¹ and the total loss of the fleet and forces in Sicily,² we find the temper and plight of Athens reflected in a comedy of serious import scarcely relieved with homely humor. Ancient testimony assigns the Lysistrata to the year 411³ without specific allocation to either one of the two dramatic festivals. It has, however, been inferred from internal evidence that it was produced at the Lenaea.⁴ The frank discussion of domestic politics

¹March 413 (Thuc. vii. 19).

²Sept. 413 (Thuc. vii. 79. 3; Plut. Nicias, 28.
Cf. Georg Busolt, Griechische Geschichte [Götha, 1893-1904],
III, Part II, 1397).

³Hypothesis to Lysistrata.

⁴Blaydes (Argumentum, Lysistrata [1880], p. v) agrees with Süvern that the public charge of theft against Peisander (Lys. 490) could not have been made so late as the City Dionysia, which would have been too near the time when the democracy was overthrown by Peisander and his friends. Van Daele (Introduction, Lysistrata [Bude edition, 1928], p. 111, note) objects that May the month of revolution, was far enough away at the time of the

accords better with that occasion. Although, superficially, the Lysistrata startles the reader with more daring obscenity than he has yet met, on closer inspection, he will become aware of a graver tone and a note of pathos, and he will find the poet more frankly didactic than in any preceding play.

The monitory vein is entirely in keeping with the spirit of the times. The Sicilian disaster not only sobered and depressed the Athenians, but it shook their confidence in themselves and in their flatterers, and rendered them more amenable to the voice of admonition and authority. The change of heart is strikingly evinced in the creation of ten Probuli to assume the supreme direction of the state's affairs.¹ Athens now despaired of winning the war,² but the Probuli resolved to save as much as possible from the wreck of the empire, and they took vigorous steps to carry out that resolution.³ Thucydides states that "both sides were busily equipping themselves for the war precisely as if they were just beginning it."⁴ No advocate of peace had arisen because no democrat dared expect favorable terms from Sparta, and the oligarchs, although active beneath the surface, had not yet matured their plans for gaining control of the government. Aristophanes felt the full force of the submerged popular longing for peace, and he alone had the courage to give it public expression at this time.

Dionysia in March to allow of such a reference. He, however, agrees that the play was produced at the Lenaea. Van Leeuwen (Prolegomena, Lysistrata [1903], p. vi note) finds in ll. 100 ff., 490 and 577-78 indications that the elections for generals had not yet been held. The elections were held from the middle of February to the middle of March (Aristotle Ath. Pol. 44, and note in Sandys' edition). Busolt-Swoboda says usually March: "Aus Aristoph. Wolk. 581 ff. ist zu schlieszen, dasz Kleons Wahl kurz vor der Sonnenfinsternis am 21. März 424 erfolgte" (Georg Busolt, Griechische Staatskunde [Zweite Hälfte bearb. von Heinrich Swoboda; München, 1926], p. 990).

¹Thuc. viii. 1. ²Thuc. viii. 1, 24, 53. ³Lys. 421-22.

⁴Thuc. viii. 5, trans. C. F. Smith.

The Lysistrata probably owes its tenor to the fact that Aristophanes was unalterably opposed to the measures adopted by the Probuli, so little calculated, as he thought, to promote the welfare of the city. Theirs was a policy of stubborn, blind resistance.¹ "They determined that they must not give in."² They were protracting the war, and it is to one of them as a sponsor of war, that Lysistrata delivers her lesson in statecraft. There are two sides to the picture, a serious side, and a mocking side. As Aristophanes credits the Probuli with honest and earnest endeavors to perform their duty to their country,³ so Lysistrata is earnest and serious in her exposition of governmental reform.⁴ But as Aristophanes regards their policy as futile and outworn,⁵ so they are the victims of taunt and mockery⁶ such as is showered upon Lamachus in the Acharnians. The poet's attitude towards the Probuli in the Lysistrata strangely resembles that which in the Acharnians he represents one of his characters as showing towards magistrates of the same name in Megara. Reporting on the wretched condition of his own city, the Megarian says: "This was the policy of the Probuli for the state, that we might perish most quickly and most miserably."⁷

¹Lys. 504-5.

²Thuc. viii. 1. 3.

³Lys. 421-22. Cf. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Aristoteles und Athen (Berlin, 1893), II, 345: "In der streitscene mit Lysistrata handelt es sich um krieg und frieden, um *στρατεια τῆς πόλεως*, also gerade um das wofür das volk die probulen eingesetzt hatte."

⁴Lys. 567-86.

⁵Lys. 599; cf. 988.

⁶Lys. 505, 532-38, 599-613.

⁷Ach. 755-56. The flouting of the Probuli in this play may be a further hint of the poet's political leaning. Rogers has pointed out that the office was essentially oligarchia (Introduction, Lysistrata, pp. xi-xiii). Aristophanes probably realized that it was a first step towards the impending revolution. His opposition, therefore, shows him no friend of oligarchy. Cf. Maurice Croiset, Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens, trans. Jas. Loeb (London, 1909), p. 137.

From beginning to end, the Lysistrata reiterates the need of peace,¹ and for this Aristophanes has been called impractical, and the morality of his suggestion has been doubted on the ground that Athens could have obtained peace from her enemies at no less a cost than the surrender of her naval supremacy.² This is to misinterpret the main proposal of the play. Aristophanes advocated no such humiliating concession. It is even fair to suppose that he tried to forestall it with better advice. A few months later, embassies were sent by the Four Hundred both to Agis at Deceleia and to the Ephors at Sparta to sue for a peace which would have meant surrender.³ Their negotiations might well be termed immoral; at any rate, they were unsuccessful. With this group of intriguing oligarchs Aristophanes was entirely out of sympathy, so much so that he insisted that the state should be rid of their ringleaders. "The Athenians," continues the critic, "would probably have agreed to treat for peace, if their enemies had offered them conditions compatible with their honor." These are the conditions precisely, as we shall see, that are suggested at the close of the play.

Furthermore, it is incorrect to object that in this play proposals of peace are directed to Athens alone. Though Attic

¹Lys. 50, 112, 118, 121, 144, 148, 154, 169, 488, 569, 901, 932, 951, 1006, 1009, 1081, 1091, 1101, 1159-61, 1185, 1264.

²Croiset, op. cit., pp. 133, 142-43. There seems to be a contradiction in Croiset's discussion. At one point (p. 140) he recognizes that "the desire for peace takes the form of diplomatic negotiations, that is, compromise." Immediately after (p. 142) he accuses Aristophanes of suggesting a peace that would be incompatible with Athenian honor.

³Thuc. viii. 70, 71, 86, 90, 91. Cf. W. S. Ferguson, "Athenian War Finance," Proceed. Mass. Hist. Soc., 1931, p. 357: "The coup d'état of the Four Hundred was a revolution within a revolution; and once its sinister object was divulged--to end the war by yielding to Sparta--the régime of the Five Thousand was installed." Cf. Cambridge Ancient History (New York, 1927), V, 336.

comedy must needs, perforce, be presented in an Athenian theatre to an Athenian audience, it may still include a Spartan rôle. The dramatic function of Lampito is to voice the poet's conviction that Sparta needs peace as much as Athens,¹ and to make the marital strike as effective in Sparta² as it is made in Athens. It is only for leadership that the poet looks to Athens. Dux femina facti. Lysistrata, a woman, rises to the occasion because there is no statesman capable of guiding Greece out of the shambles.

When now we plainly heard you saying in the streets, "Is there not a man in the country?" and some other said, "Certainly not, by Jove!" after this it was immediately determined by us women to assemble and save Greece in common.³

Such remarks may well have been current on the streets of Athens, and some of the speakers, as Tyrwhitt and Rogers⁴ suppose, may have regretted the absent Alcibiades, but Lysistrata's needs required a safer and a saner leader than Alcibiades had proved himself to be thus far. In fact, his very record of intrigue quite disqualified him for espousing the cause which Aristophanes had at heart.

It is not only the lack of statesmanship, but it is also the sorry plight to which Greece had come through following misguided politicians, that inspired the poet to draw his vivid picture of indignant feminine protest. The starting point of the

¹Lys. 117-18, 144, 169. ²Lys. 998-1006. ³Lys. 523-26.

⁴Lysistrata, ed. Rogers, l. 524, note. On the face of it, the question, "Is there not a man in the country?" could mean simply that Attica has been denuded of her manhood of military age by the constant drafting of troops. This is the way it is taken by Gilbert Norwood (Greek Comedy [London, 1931], p. 246) and by Gilbert Murray (Aristophanes [Oxford, 1933], p. 169). But the whole context of the passage emphasizes the lack of good leadership as one of the scholiasts perceived. He explains: "We have not a man in Attica worth mentioning" (ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ λόγος ἡμῖν). It is evidently to this passage that Wilamowitz refers: "Der Ruf 'es fehlt der Führer' wird auch hier erhoben; Lysistrate mag ihn im Spiele ersetzen" (Introduction, Lysistrata, p. 51).

argument is a confirmation of the picture drawn by Thucydides of the desperate straits of Athens.¹ The men by pernicious counsels have thrown the state into confusion.² They have involved it in unnecessary war.³ War has not only been a care to men;⁴ it has been their only care. They have deliberately thwarted diplomatic efforts to end it.⁵ Even in defeat, they cling to it as the only means of salvation.⁶ They would rather continue on the road to destruction than be saved.⁷ They will pursue the conflict as long as a ship is available, or a talent in the treasury;⁸ and so long will it be impossible for them to come to terms with their enemies. They have wasted Panhellenic funds on an anti-Hellenic war, until they have brought the country to the verge of ruin, and are unwilling or unable to replenish the treasury by direct taxation.⁹

This is the significant point in the poet's review of the Athenian débâcle. It is the main point of conflict in the play. The plot is a combination of two motives loosely linked together, the sex strike and the seizure of the Acropolis.¹⁰ The former is treated humorously, the latter seriously. The practical Spartan, Lampito, doubts that even so brilliant and devastating an idea as a sex strike will counteract the belligerency of those who possess triremes and treasure.¹¹ It is by the disclosure of her plan to

¹Lysistrata's reserve in ll. 37-38 is partly serious, partly rhetorical. She affects a disinclination to reveal the unhappy state of her own city.

²Lys. 489, 491, 511, 517, 522, 565; cf. 1048, 1232.

³Lys. 497. ⁴Lys. 520, 538. ⁵Lys. 1231 ff.

⁶Lys. 497. ⁷Lys. 499, 501. ⁸Lys. 173-74, 422, 654.

⁹Lys. 565, 653-55; cf. scholiast on 653. Cf. K. J. Beloch, Die attische Politik seit Perikles (Leipzig, 1884), p. 66.

¹⁰Cf. Norwood, op. cit., p. 249. ¹¹Lys. 170-74.

seize the treasure¹ that Lysistrata reassures Lampito of Athenian good faith, and induces her to participate in the strike. Thus, Aristophanes shows himself aware that, for good or ill, Athenian policy depended upon the control of the treasury.

The principal scene of the play is that between Lysistrata and one of the Probuli, and the latter's entrance is motivated by his purpose of drawing money from the Acropolis.² This furnishes Lysistrata with a text for her whole sermon on the ills of mal-administration, and it is important to notice that the question of finance is fundamental. To the bewildered Probulus, who is utterly unable to comprehend the reason for the mad feminine coup d'état, it is carefully explained that the women intend to keep the treasure safe in order that it may not be used for war.³ Whatever else discredited politicians may do, they shall no longer misapply the public monies,⁴ which the women will guard like hornets whose nest is being robbed of its honey.⁵ Then follows a lengthy and instructive discussion upon the sufferings occasioned by war, concluding with the final justification for the intervention of the women, that they contribute as much and more to the cost of war as the men. They contribute their sons.⁶ Lysistrata's point is duly stressed by the leader of the chorus of women, who accuses the men of spending the great financial reserve that had been accumulated from surplus of tribute since the Persian Wars, and when that was exhausted, of shirking their property tax.⁷

By the time Aristophanes produced his play, there could

¹Lys. 175-80.

²Lys. 421-22, 496. Cf. Wilamowitz, A.u.A., II, 345.

³Lys. 486-89.

⁴Lys. 491-92.

⁵Lys. 475; cf. Eq. 794.

⁶Lys. 588-90.

⁷Lys. 651-55; cf. Vesp. 1098-1101.

have been little money left on the Acropolis. The special fund of 1,000 talents which Pericles had reserved for defense if Athens were besieged,¹ was far spent in the building of new triremes.² Other reserves had been previously exhausted to outfit the two fleets lost at Syracuse.³ The tribute from the cities of the empire had so fallen off that it had been commuted to a 5 per cent tax on their sea-borne trade, in the hope of realizing greater returns.⁴ The domestic property tax or eisphora, that final resort in raising public revenue, had been employed more than once,⁵

¹Thuc. ii. 24.

²The decision to make use of the special reserve was made when Athens learned of the revolt of Chios, soon after it occurred (Thuc. viii. 15. 1). The revolt was brought about by Alcibiades and the Spartan, Chalcideus, not long after the Isthmian Games, which were held not later than April-May 412 (Thuc. viii. 10-12; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1422, note 3). Philochorus (scholium on Lys. 173=F.H.G. 116) says that it was in the archonship of Callias (412-411) that authority was given to use the reserve. The date of the decision is, therefore, given as July 412 (Busolt, loc. cit.). Wilamowitz thought that Philochorus was mistaken, and would put the date in the spring (A.u.A., II, 346-47). In Lys. 313 the chorus of old men appeal for assistance to the generals in Samos. Seven of these were in Ionian waters in 412. The first to reach Samos was Strombichides (Thuc. viii. 16) whom the Athenians decided to send at the same time as they decided to use the reserve. Thrasykles, Diomedon, and Leon soon followed him. Phrynichus, Onomacles, and Scironides arrived at the head of a new fleet at the end of the summer (Thuc. viii. 25. 1). The reference in Lys. 313 is, therefore, to be dated later than mid-summer 412 when resort was had to the reserve, and shows that Aristophanes was aware that the reserve had already been used to a very considerable extent in raising these squadrons. It is altogether likely, as Rogers and Wilamowitz point out, that the verse hints at the political dissension between these generals which became so notorious in the next year (cf. Thuc. viii. 73, and Beloch, Attische Politik, p. 66).

³CAH, V, 313; W. S. Ferguson, The Treasurers of Athena (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), p. 38.

⁴Thuc. vii. 28.

⁵Antiphon First Tetralogy § 12; Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, p. 1223. Cf. Thuc. iii. 19 and Eq. 924. A. B. West believes that the eisphora was levied annually from 428 to 425-424 and then dropped "when the scale of the new imperial assessment gave Athens reason to hope that this tax upon wealthy Athenian citizens would be no longer necessary" ("Cleon's Assessment and the Athenian Budget," TAPA, LXI [1930], 220). E. Cavaignac, Études sur l'histoire

but to judge from the words of the chorus,¹ it had not produced gratifying results. In any case, as Pericles had pointed out, war could not be financed by the eisphora.² Athens was unable to support her fleet which, from its base at Samos, was reduced to the necessity of forcing contributions from such cities as it could still command.³ It stooped still lower, and presently began negotiations with Alcibiades to obtain subsidies from the Persian satrap⁴ with which to fight a Spartan fleet already in Persian pay.⁵ The logic of this sequence of events was perfectly evident to a Panhellenist like Aristophanes, as he shows in the reconciliation scene at the end of the play. The unstanched flow of irreplaceable wealth could lead only to financial, as the policies which it supported were leading to political, suicide for Greece. The spending of the Periclean reserve, which provides the bone of contention between Lysistrata and the Probulus, was already beyond the power of anyone to prevent. But the principle involved was still a living issue, as we know from the fact that Athens was able to finance the struggle for another six years. Aristophanes was not so much concerned with the maintenance of a reserve as with condemning improper expenditure for vicious purposes of such revenues as were available. The Lysistrata is just one more illustration of his dauntless courage in exposing fatal tendencies of current policies.

The need for economy was recognized by the revolutionists of this year in abolishing all pay except for military service,⁶

financière d'Athènes au Ve siècle (Paris, 1908), p. 124, says: "L'eisphora disparut après l'augmentation des tributs, mais reparut au temps de la guerre décélifique" (Lysias xxi. 3).

¹Lys. 654. ²Thuc. i. 141. 5. ³Thuc. viii. 76.

⁴Thuc. viii. 48 ff. ⁵Thuc. viii. 29, 36, 37, 45, 53, 57, 58.5.

⁶Thuc. viii. 65. 3, 67. 3; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 29. 5.
Cf. Thuc. viii. 4.

and in reorganizing the boards of treasurers.¹ Both points are noted in the Lysistrata, and even appropriated by the conspiracy of women. When the Probulus asks what Lysistrata proposes to do with the treasure, she replies, "We shall act as its treasurers,"² and as qualifications for the office, she cites the experience of wives in acting as household treasurers. As for the abolition of pay for civil service, the chorus of old men accuse the women of having been incited to seize the wages upon which they lived.³ It is probable that Aristophanes approved of both of these reforms, which he incorporated in the plan of Lysistrata. The limitation of pay to military service corresponds to his suggestion in the Wasps.⁴

This exposure of the abuses of public finance is only a link in the chain of consistency between the argument of the Lysistrata and those of preceding plays. The misfortunes of his city only confirm Aristophanes in his inveterate conviction of the essential immorality of the Peloponnesian War which was financed by Athens out of funds contributed by her allies, not for aggression against other Greeks, but for the common protection against the barbarian.⁵ The gratitude which Athens had once earned when Cimon led her ships against the Mede⁶ has now been converted into unpopularity and hatred through the anti-Hellenic

¹Aristotle Ath. Pol. 30. 2; cf. Ferguson, Treasurers, p. 4.

²Lys. 493-95.

³Lys. 625.

⁴Vesp. 1120-21; cf. infra, p. 54, n. 3.

⁵Cf. Vesp. 1098-1101.

⁶Cf. A. B. West, "The Tribute Lists and the Non-tributary Members of the Delian League," Amer. Hist. Rev., XXXV (1929-30), 267-275; "A second passage from the life of Cimon (Plutarch Cim. 18) indicates that at the time of his last expedition to Cyprus there was discontent among the allies because Athens, by fighting Hellenes in Greece, had abused the power given her for the purpose of liberating and protecting Hellenes in Asia."

decrees of her imperialistic democracy.¹ The revolt of Miletus alone is mentioned as typical of the defection of the allies.² Even in Comedy, a poet cannot too obtrusively remind his audience of their losses.³

The thesis that Aristophanes has maintained with such insistent iteration with regard to Athens in particular, he believes to be equally true of Greece as a whole. The threatened ruin of Athens, he reasons, must reflect the condition of Laconia⁴ and Boeotia.⁵ This point of view proves Aristophanes both the Panhellenist and the patriot. He had a native pride in the city of the fair triremes, and he knew that she usually gave a good account of herself to her enemies. If she had suffered at their hands, they would likewise bear the scars which she had inflicted. The Lysistrata, therefore, opens on the same Panhellenic note as the Peace. The great affair for which Lysistrata has marshalled her Amazons,⁶ is the salvation of Greece by common action,⁷ and she expects delegates from Sparta and Boeotia⁸ and Corinth;⁹ for if the women do not act in common, there may soon no longer be any

¹Lys. 699.

²Lys. 108; Thuc. viii. 17.

³The merely incidental reference in this play to the revolt of Miletus may show that Aristophanes remembered the expensive lesson which had been taught to Phrynichus, whom he so often mentions honoris causa (Vesp. 220, 269; Av. 749; Thesm. 164). Phrynichus had been fined 1,000 drachmae for reminding the Athenians of the Capture of Miletus in 494 (Bury) by producing a play of that name. The play was thenceforth forbidden. Vide, Herodotus vi. 21; Busolt, G.G., II, 566, note 1. Haigh and Schmid-Stählin think the prohibition applied only to the rural Dionysia (A.E.Haigh, The Attic Theatre [2nd ed.; Oxford, 1898], p. 96; Wilhelm Schmid und Otto Stählin, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur [München, 1934], II, 173). E. Meyer (Geschichte des Altertums [Stuttgart und Berlin, 1915], III², 313) and Schmid-Stählin (op. cit., p. 173) think that the play was produced in the Archonship of Themistocles (492), who arranged for its production as anti-Persian propaganda.

⁴Lys. 33, 995-96, 1002-3, 1078.

⁵Lys. 35.

⁶Lys. 23, 678.

⁷Lys. 29, 41, 525.

⁸Lys. 40, 75, 86.

⁹Lys. 91.

Peloponnesians,¹ and the Boeotians may all have perished.² The suffering of Lacedaemon is extended to her allies.³

But, though sharing with the Peace the distinction of being one of the two most conspicuously Panhellenic of all the comedies, the Lysistrata has this important difference, that it charges no person nor party with being the pestle of war.⁴ The reason is not far to seek. By the institution of the Probuli, the Athenians had of their own accord confessed want of confidence in the demagogues. Sharp demarcations of party lines were for the time obscured. Aristophanes delivers his usual scathing comments on prominent demagogues. He ridicules Demostratus for his part in promoting the ill-fated Sicilian Expedition.⁵ He impugns the integrity of Peisander⁶ who was already deeply involved in revolutionary designs. But, he has the same censure for the oligarchic clubs which were more interested in getting control of public office than concerned for the public welfare.⁷ With strict impartiality, he advocates the removal of all corruption in poli-

¹Lys. 33.

²Lys. 35.

³Lys. 995, 1179-80.

⁴Cf. Norwood, op. cit., p. 246: "When his [Aristophanes'] semi-choruses at last combine, they begin with the amazing words, 'Gentlemen, we are not preparing to utter a single ill word against any citizen: no, our intent is to say and do all the good we can, for the troubles already on our hands are enough' " (Lys. 1043 ff.).

⁵Lys. 391-97; Plut. Nic. 12, 13; Alc. 18; cf. Thuc.vi.25.1. G. M. Calhoun, Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation (Austin, 1913), pp. 121-22, says: "Whether Demostratus was one of Alcibiades' associates we do not know. But he was, like Alcibiades, a man of noble family who had elected to enter public life as a leader of the democracy (schol. on Lys. 397-98, Gilbert, Beiträge, p. 249), and may well have belonged to his club or another of similar character." Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1282, note 3.

⁶Lys. 490. Peisander began as a democrat (Andocides i. 36). Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1461, note 1, says: "Als Demokrat erscheint er noch bei Aristoph. Lys. 490." But he soon appears as the most active instrument in the hands of the revolutionists of 411 (Thuc. viii. 49, 53; cf. Beloch, Attische Politik, pp. 62-63).

⁷Lys. 490, 575-78; Thuc. viii. 54.

tics, including both demagogues and clubs. Croiset has admirably explained and stressed this point. The poet, he says,

attacks all ambitious persons, without distinction of party Everything combines to characterize his political tendency as absolutely independent. . . . The interests of Athens are inseparable from the common interests of the Greeks He does not make this appeal in the name of any party. He conceived it under the influence of a sentiment that was more Hellenic than Athenian, and perhaps more human than Hellenic. At this period of his life, he seems to have been painfully conscious of the harm Greece was doing to herself by dismembering herself with her own hands The poet places himself above party considerations by the choice of his representatives, and seems to give us to understand that he is devoted to a more general and truly human interest.¹

The choice of a woman as the protagonist of the poet's ideals is significant in a number of ways. It emphasizes the lack of leadership in state policy. It places the project above and beyond party entanglements. It smoothes the way for rapprochement between the warring Greek states, by discrediting the government which was committed to war. It is a convenient method of introducing a motive that was used with telling effect in the Acharnians,² viz., humanitarian sentiment.

This is the most powerful and effective appeal of the whole play. It at once provides the stimulus which justifies the plot, and the chief hope of converting the audience. Protracted periods

¹Croiset, op. cit., pp. 134, 137, 138, 140, 141-42. Croiset's view is strongly supported by Rogers whose deep sympathy with Aristophanes lends great weight to his opinion. Cf. his Introduction to Lysistrata, p. xlv: "And it is worthy of note that, as in the other Comedies, so here, there is not the slightest trace of political partisanship; the reforms suggested are such as would commend themselves to every loyal citizen." Cf. his note on Eq. 1382: "Aristophanes was in no sense a political partisan; he merely aimed at the removal of abuses which would be recognized and deplored by all honest citizens."

²The amusing stage business of Ach. 729-835 relieves but is not intended to conceal the misery of a starving Megarian forced to sell his children by the privations of war. The sacrifice that war entails upon women is also suggested in the same play (ll. 1056-66) with the usual combination of humor and serious meaning. Cf. Lys. 62.

of separation from their husbands have made Greek wives desperate, have induced the mood in which they can adopt unnatural means to end an unnatural situation, an unendurable absence, an unjustifiable war.¹ At the same time, vivid touches of pathos, like mirrors, afford the auditor occasion for reflection on the unhappy condition of himself and his family. The starving daughters of the Megarian were amusing pigs, but Lysistrata's picture of the helpless bereavement of countless mothers, sisters, and betrothed maidens is too pathetic to be funny.² Patiently smiling, silently grieving, gently protesting through all the years of war, the women have sat within doors, sticking to their knitting,³ watching the casualty lists grow, aware that the men were becoming more involved in war, and less hopeful of peace. If they were ignorant of the subtleties of policy, they were certain of the more elementary truth that internecine strife was folly. This is what Aristophanes means by his repeated contrast of the wisdom of the women with the folly of the men. The nonsense of the play, while tending to provide relief from the seriousness of the argument, at the same time adds force to the main point. So potent is the truth that war is folly, that the women are willing to forego an equally fundamental passion to prove the necessity of peace.⁴ The crisis demands sense and intelligence, not iron spikes,⁵ says Lysistrata. If the men had had sense, they would have governed the state as the women card their fleece.⁶ For a woman, too, has sense and is not so poor in thought that she should be grudged a hearing if she has counsel to prefer better than the

¹Lys. 99-106.

²Lys. 591-97. Cf. J. B. Bury, A History of Greece, (London, 1913), p. 489.

³Lys. 510-20.

⁴Lys. 117-18, 142-44.

⁵Lys. 432.

⁶Lys. 572-73.

bankrupt appeal to arms.¹ She has as great a stake in the state as man. She has borne sons to serve as hoplites. War, which so long has been a masculine obsession, shall now receive the attention of the women.² They have resolved to effect the rescue of their fellow-citizens and Greece³ from war and insanity. They are wise, virtuous, patriotic,⁴ but their patriotism is not local merely; it is Panhellenic, and their mission is to end the troubles in all the countries of Greece,⁵ for the safety to Greece depends upon them.⁶

The methods to be used are three: common action, reconciliation, and compromise. The expression "in common" is conspicuously repeated throughout the play.⁷ The women of Athens, Boeotia, and the Peloponnese resolve to save Greece in common. The courageous enterprise enlists the support of a chorus of female recruits, who are willing to venture everything with their leaders,⁸ and will earn the title of Lysimachae⁹ for ridding Greece of militarism. Among the concomitant evils of a protracted war, they have grown weary of the armed loungers in the market place, and the petty tyranny of a lawless and licentious soldiery, whose bright uniforms have lost their glamor, and only succeed in arousing the scorn of their civilian victims.¹⁰ As the plot develops into a conflict with the constituted authorities at Athens, Lysistrata outlines a program of reform to the bewildered

¹Lys. 638-39, 649-50, 1124-25. ²Lys. 520, 538.

³Lys. 342, 498-99, 501. ⁴Lys. 546-47.

⁵Lys. 566. Cf. notes of Rogers and Van Leeuwen, who agree that here the plural χωραὶς = city states. Wilamowitz says that the usage is unattested (note ad loc.) but it is difficult to see what other meaning can be given to the plural.

⁶Lys. 29-30, 1004-6, 1111. ⁷Lys. 41, 525, 579, 1111, 1129.

⁸Lys. 543-44. ⁹Lys. 554; cf. Pax 992. ¹⁰Lys. 555-64.

Probulus, of which the cardinal principle is to card everyone into a basket of common goodwill.¹ The conspiracy results in complete success for the forces of Lysistrata. Her chorus of old women wins over the chorus of old men, and the two join in a common song of goodfellowship.² Her charm so captivates the foremost of the Greeks that they come to terms with her and submit their grievances to her in common.³ She thereupon delivers a common rebuke to the men from Lacedaemon and from Athens for proving false to their community of race and religion. The passage is a notable one:

I wish to take you and rebuke you in common, as you have deserved, you, who, like kinsmen, from one font sprinkle the altars at Olympia, at Thermopylae, at Delphi--and how many others could I name if it were right to extend the list!--and, though barbarian foes are at hand with an army,⁴ you destroy men and cities of Hellas.⁵

The central thought of this gentle castigation is undoubtedly, as Wilamowitz⁶ says, the oft-repeated theme that Greeks should unite against the ancestral enemy. The sentiment, however, in the present instance, is expressed not as an exhortation but as a denunciation. The intention of the remonstrance is to arouse a sense of guilt preliminary to repentance. What offence would lie heaviest on the Spartan conscience at this time? Fortunately, Thucydides has put the answer to our question in the mouth of a Spartan, even Lichas, the spokesman of the commission sent out to investigate the conduct of the Spartan admiral.⁷ Reviewing the Treaty of Miletus, Lichas admitted that, by its terms, "instead of

¹Lys. 579.

²Lys. 1042.

³Lys. 1110-11.

⁴The dative is construed thus with the participle by Blaydes, Wilamowitz, and Coulon- Van Daele. Droysen and Van Leeuwen take it with the finite verb in the next line.

⁵Lys. 1128-34.

⁶Note ad loc.

⁷Thuc. viii. 38. 4, 39. 2.

bringing freedom, the Lacedaemonians would place the Persian yoke upon the Hellenes. Accordingly, he urged that another and a better treaty be concluded."¹ The reproach of Lysistrata would above everything else call to mind the Treaty of Miletus, as the chief instrument by which Greek had betrayed Greek, and Panhellenic sentiment had been outraged. This would be the inevitable psychological effect of the lines. The scholiast, therefore, does not err in explaining them as a reference to the Spartan use of barbarian allies.² The terms of the treaty specifically set forth that Sparta and Persia were to wage a common war against Athens and mention that a Persian fleet was expected.³ Holding the view that he did, we should hardly expect Aristophanes to refrain from criticism of this Spartan-Persian alliance, which was the most far-reaching political development of the period. As the Lysistrata was produced at the Lenaea, before an audience almost entirely Athenian, he did not need to fear lest he alienate Spartan sympathy for his project by criticizing her policy. The scholiast is right as far as he goes, but he has not gone far enough. "In this section of her speech," as Rogers justly remarks, "Lysistrata

¹Thuc. viii. 43. 3-4, trans. C. F. Smith; cf. Thuc. viii.52. Throughout the course of the war, Sparta and Athens had been in keen competition for the support of Persia. The Treaty of Miletus marked the success of Spartan diplomacy, or rather indicated that Persia had finally decided which Greek state to make her pawn. The first Treaty of Miletus was agreed to in midsummer 412 (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1426). By it Sparta acknowledged the King's sovereignty over all the dominions ruled by his ancestors (Thuc. viii. 18) which included not only Ionia, but the islands and a large part of Northern and Central Greece. The treaty was modified in a second version (Thuc. viii. 37) about November (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1443). Lichas criticized the treaty and quarreled with Tissaphernes in January 411 (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1449). In February 411 the treaty was renewed in a third version (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1451) which limited the King's sovereignty to Asia (Thuc. viii. 58).

²Schol. on Lys. 1135 (Dindorf).

³Thuc. viii. 58. 7; cf. Thuc. viii. 18. 2, 37. 4. For the presence and activity of Persian armed forces in Ionia, cf. Thuc. viii. 20, 28, 46, 48. 6.

is expressly confining herself to actions for which both parties are equally blamable."¹ Paulmier² pointed out that the censure of Lysistrata applies also to the Athenians who were responsible for the presence in Greece of the Thracian mercenaries who perpetrated the revolting massacre at Mycalessus in 413.³ Thracian mercenaries had been used also late in 414 by Athens in an expedition which, in concert with the unreliable king of Macedon, she made against her own colony of Amphipolis.⁴ It is clear from the Acharnians⁵ that Aristophanes' attitude towards receiving assistance from barbarians, whether Thracian or Persian, was one of ridicule and protest. The Athenians were still not above making great sacrifices to transfer the Persian alliance from Sparta to themselves, as they showed by their response to the unsubstantial promises of Alcibiades.⁶ In actual fact, both Athens and Sparta were ready to use any barbarian help, whether military or financial, against each other. This competition for foreign support was a more vital political issue at the time of the composition of the Lysistrata⁷ than when the Acharnians was written. Lysistrata's charge against the two offending cities is formulated in general, perhaps ambiguous, terms. Grammatically, it can be construed in different ways, but its interpretation is not so much a matter of grammar as of appreciation of the historical setting. The most general accusation was sufficient to suggest all the implications of the offence. Least of all, would the most flagrant feature of it be forgotten by the audience. The scholiast has seized upon

¹Note ad loc.

²Note ad loc. in editions of Enger and Blaydes.

³Thuc. vii. 29. ⁴Thuc. vii. 9; CAH, V, 279. ⁵Ach. 61-174.

⁶Thuc. viii. 47. 2, 48. 2, 53. 1-2, 56. 2, and especially 81-82.

⁷Thuc. viii. 81. 1.

this heinous aspect of the latest Spartan policy, and his interpretation is justified psychologically, if not grammatically.¹ But, to his critics² we may concede that the objection to using barbarian mercenaries is an implied or accessory charge. The fundamental point of Lysistrata's remonstrance is her deprecation of the destruction of Hellas by Hellenes, witnessed and encouraged, according to one view, or aided and abetted according to the other view, by a hostile barbarian power which alone stood to benefit.³ It is very probable that we have not even yet exhausted the latent suggestion of the lines, and the capacity of Aristophanes for innuendo. Droysen may be quite correct in translating as though Lysistrata presents the alternative of a Greek offensive against the barbarian:

Mit Heeresmacht, da's doch genug Barbaren giebt,
Ihr Hellas Söhnen, Hellas Städten Verderben bringt!⁴

Droysen's interpretation is supported by those editors who quote Horace:

Audiet cives acuisse ferrum,

¹Wilamowitz (note ad loc.) suggests that the scholiast construed the passage thus: "Though the foe is at hand, you destroy men and cities of Hellas with an army of barbarians." Hermann (Vide critical note in editions of Blaydes and Van Leeuwen) apparently accepted this interpretation and emended the text accordingly. The emendation is not necessary. The fact that the couplet can be construed in various ways shows that the expression is suggestive rather than precise. The MS reading of the lines in question (Lys. 1133-34) is:

ἐχθρῶν παρόντων βαρβάρων στρατεύματι
Ἑλλήνας ἀνδρας καὶ πόλεις ἀπόλλυτε.

Hermann read βαρβάρους στρατεύματι in l. 1133.

²Van Leeuwen, Rogers, and Wilamowitz in notes ad loc.

³It is interesting to note that the effect upon the Greek combatants of Persian policy directed by Alcibiades is here denounced by Aristophanes in words which almost create the suspicion that he was aware of that pernicious policy and that sinister advice. Cf. Thuc. viii. 46. 2 and 4, 56. 2, 57.

⁴Des Aristophanes Werke übersetzt von J. G. Droysen (Berlin, 1838), Part III, 215.

Quo graves Persae melius perirent.¹

The Panhellenic games and the Amphictyonic League have always been heralded as important unifying agents in Greek history.² Aristophanes himself stresses the Panhellenic character of the Olympic Games later in the Plutus in which he speaks of Zeus creating the competition at Olympia where every fifth year he gathers all the Hellenes together.³ Lysistrata does well to combine her rebuke with an appeal to such powerful motives. She chides the culprits for common violation of common ties. She reminds them of the great sanctuaries, where they find common ground, and where the sacred truce prevails. We know from Thucydides⁴ that in 412 the truce was observed at the Isthmian Games and that Athenians and Peloponnesians did meet there in peace, and that until the games were over, Corinth resisted the impatience of her allies to send ships to aid revolting Chios. Lysistrata's reference to Thermopylae goes home, and presently, under the genial influence of Bacchus, the Spartans come forth from the banquet, singing of the great days when Athens held the strait by sea and Sparta kept the pass by land, and both fought for Greece in common.⁵ Common action, therefore, on the part of the women of Greece is the first essential means by which they plan to achieve a Panhellenic peace.

In the second place, the happy consummation of the dramatic project is sanctioned by the ministrations of the Aristophanic

¹Horace Odes 1. 2. 21 quoted by Enger, Blaydes, Van Leeuwen, and Van Daele.

²Cf. the eloquent appeal to Panhellenism in Herod. viii. 144. 2, and a minor reference in Xenophon: "The Eleans told Agis that even in ancient times it was the custom that Greeks should not use the oracles for a war against Greeks" (Hell. iii. 2. 22). Cf. also, E. Curtius, "The Unity of Greece," History of Greece, trans. A. W. Ward (New York, 1902), Bk. II, chap. 4.

³Plutus 583-84.

⁴Thuc. viii. 9-10.

⁵Lys. 1247-61.

divinity, revealed more perfectly than heretofore. Peace appears in Aristophanes in varied manifestations. Guided by the poetic hierophant, the audience has been initiated into her mysteries progressively, as play has succeeded play with increasing but varied emphasis upon the need of Peace. In the Acharnians, the Archangel¹ Amphytheus is sent as a forerunner to confer upon Dicaeopolis the first-fruits of her blessing in the form of Spondai, a truce.² The Acharnian chorus chants a hymn of thanksgiving to their dimly described benefactress Diallage, Reconciliation.³ From the hymn, we learn her real name for the first time. The blessing of Spondai is mentioned again in the Knights.⁴ In the Peace we behold the elevation of the cult image, there called Eirene by Panhellenic devotees under the leadership of Trygaeus, and the revival of the worship of Peace which has suffered eclipse during the war.⁵ In the Lysistrata, we have the final revelation of the divine Diallage as an active and beneficent presence.

The invocation to Peace as Diallage in the earliest extant play at the Lenaea of 425, her Panhellenic appearance as Eirene at the Great Dionysia of 421, and her more informal re-appearance as Diallage at the Lenaea of 411 show that the Aristophanic treatment does not so much represent a development of the poet's conception of peace in Hellas, as it indicates his skill and diplomacy in making the most effective appeal on behalf of that conception in changing political circumstances, and under different dramatic conditions. At the Great Dionysia of 421, before visitors from many Greek states, and on the eve of the Peace of Nicias which was declared immediately afterwards,⁶ Aristophanes'

¹The epithet is borrowed from Gilbert Murray, op. cit., p. 29.

²Ach. 175-202. ³Ach. 988-92. ⁴Eg. 1388-91.

⁵Pax 296-308, 520-26, 974-77. ⁶Thuc. v. 20.

main object was to consolidate the position already gained. Not so much concerned with suggesting the means to an end, as with celebrating the advantages of an end about to be achieved, he used the generic term, eirene, to represent the expected result of Panhellenic unanimity.¹ At the Lenaeon festivals of 425 and 411, when peace was desperately desired and not confidently foreseen as in 421, before a local Athenian audience whose opinion he wished to influence, the dramatist dealt with the question of peace from the angle from which he thought it could best be approached by the statesman. The rôles of Dicaeopolis and Lysistrata differ from that of Trygaeus in this respect, that, while the latter espouses a popular cause,² the two former protagonists present long and serious³ arguments in the face of bitter opposition. Dicaeopolis advocates spondai, and Lysistrata, diallage. The earlier suggestion is more temporary and more cautious, the later more fundamental. They are put forward as necessary and consecutive preliminaries to a stable peace. The Nician treaty of 421 had not fulfilled its too sanguine promises. Its provisions were never wholly realized. In the sequel, it proved more a truce than a peace, and not of the thirty years' vintage either.⁴ In a con-

¹Cf. A. B. West, "The Aristidean Tribute in the Assessment of 421 B.C.," Amer. Jour. of Archaeol. XXIX (1925), 138: "The Peace of Aristophanes is not to be considered merely a work of propaganda like so many of his plays. It lacks the crusading spirit, for the man against whom Aristophanes had fought for years was now dead. The Peace, then, is to be considered a mirror of the dominant sentiment in Athens in the spring of 421, in which the ideals of the practical politician . . . had been overwhelmed by the flood of joy that peace had come, by a pan-Hellenic spirit which obliterated the bounds between former enemies, and restored to Greece that spirit of coöperation on which the Delian League had been based, a spirit now so long buried deep with the Goddess of Peace."

²Pax 301-10.

³Cf. Ach. 26-39 and Lys. 26-27, where both profess to have been long and seriously disquieted about a matter of deep concern to them, the question of peace.

⁴Cf. Ach. 194; Eq. 1388.

sidered judgment Thucydides¹ declares that there was no real peace, and Aristophanes was not unprepared for disappointment. There were notes of discord in the alleged unanimity of his Peace. We return to reality in the Lysistrata where, with renewed determination, he makes a final attempt to reconstruct the indispensable foundation of Hellenic harmony, reconciliation between Athens and Sparta.

A truce lacks the permanence of a peace.² The good faith of peace depends upon reconciliation. It is only through failure to give full significance to the dominant term in the Lysistrata, that any doubt can be entertained of the morality of Aristophanes' proposal in this play. Although the synonyms "truce" and "peace" occur, the common word used by the women to name their objective is "reconciliation."³ The term was even adopted as a sub-title for the play.⁴ We must insist upon the distinction, as we insist upon the patriotism of the poet who gloried in the valor of Myronides and the brilliant exploits of Phormio.⁵ He did not propose surrender but reconciliation upon such terms as were fair to both sides. One of the conditions for Athens, implicit in most of the comedies of Aristophanes, is the retention of the Athenian

¹Thuc. v. 26. 2.

²Cf. Andocides Orat. 3. 11.

³Lys. 628, 900, 932, 984, 1009, 1091, 1101, 1104, 1114, 1161, 1175. Cf. Ach. 989. The frequent occurrence of the word and its cognates is conspicuous in that part of the play where the pacific plans of Lysistrata come to fruition. "Spondai," its cases and cognates occur six times; "eirene" and its cases occur nine times in the play, as compared with the eleven examples of "diallage" and its cases and cognates. Similarly, "spondai" is the dominant term in the Acharnians, and "eirene" is dominant in the Peace.

⁴Cf. scholiast on Lys. 1114.

⁵Lys. 801-4. For Myronides cf. Eccl. 303, and for Phormio cf. Eq. 562, Pax 347. Cf. Rogers' note on Eccl. 303: "Phormio and Myronides, whose names are coupled in Lysistrata 801-4 seem to have been the favorite heroes of Aristophanes, in the times which followed the Persian Wars"

naval hegemony. That will become more apparent from the examination of Lysistrata's didactic simile in the next chapter. In passing, it may be noticed that the counter-chorus of old men naturally assume that, since the conspiring women have possessed themselves of the treasury, they will proceed to build ships for a navy.¹ Though the women are in conflict with the Probulus whose first official care is to procure timber for oars,² and though they quiet Lampito's fears of their triremes,³ the success of their plot is still marked by naval reminiscences.⁴ A comparison of Lámpito's dread of the triremes with the Spartan eulogy of Artemisium suffices to show that Lysistrata does not propose to sacrifice the Athenian fleet but to direct it to other uses.

Her peace proposals are moral, patriotic, and Panhellenic, soundly built upon the only permanent foundation, upon terms of reconciliation acceptable to the contracting parties, and in general harmony with the policy of the preceding plays wherein Aristophanes advocates a return to the status quo ante bellum. To the charge that he is not practical, the poet's proper answer would be that no solution of the troubles of Greece would be practical until it led to the elimination of the causes of war, which he conceived to be the aggrandisement of one city at the expense of others.

The manner in which Lysistrata proceeds to recommend her plan of reconciliation is instructive, because it further illustrates the Aristophanic point of view. The first step, obviously, is to despatch embassies⁵ to the enemy, and to induce them to send representatives with full authority⁶ to make peace. Meanwhile,

¹Lys. 674-75.

²Lys. 421-22; cf. Thuc.viii.4.

³Lys. 173-74.

⁴Lys. 1250-53.

⁵Lys. 570.

⁶Lys. 1009-10.

the Athenian senate is to select a similar delegation.¹ Plenipotentiaries from Sparta are not slow to arrive with proper credentials,² whereupon the spirit of reconciliation, Diallage, who does not lack physical attraction, and whose persuasive art with its feminine charm is in delightful contrast to the ruder methods of masculine diplomacy, is instructed to lead both Spartans and Athenians before the ingenious promoter of the pact.³ As we have seen, Lysistrata rebukes them in common for the unnatural havoc which they have wrought upon Greeks and Greek cities. She appeals to the motives of the Panhellenic games and the Amphyctyonic League. Then follows the most characteristic argument of Aristophanes. In this, his most serious play, he sets the stage for the most elaborate and most serious presentation of his basic political principle. He presents it not as a woman's sentimental theory,⁴ but as a historical reality, a tradition inherited from the days of Athenian greatness, and associated with the name of that admiral whose greatest naval victories were won against the common enemy of all Greeks, and who almost succeeded in combining popularity at Athens with friendship for Sparta.⁵ Lysistrata, like Aristophanes, has learned wisdom from her elders. She draws her precepts and examples from the mutual helpfulness of the past.⁶ First, she reminds the Spartans of the crisis of 464, when pro-Spartan policy reached its maximum influence at Athens under Cimon.⁷ Aristophanes

¹Lys. 1011-12. ²Lys. 983-84, 1072-73, 1101-2.

³Lys. 1114-21. ⁴Lys. 1124-27. ⁵Plut.Cim. 16.

⁶It is interesting to note that Xenophon puts Lysistrata's very arguments into the mouths of Spartan ambassadors who came to seek help from Athens when the Thebans invaded Laconia after Leuctra (Hell. vi. 5. 33-34). If the appeal is not a commonplace, one could suppose that Xenophon had learned his lesson in rhetoric from Aristophanes. The parallelism between the Xenophontic passage and the Lysistrata is striking. The Plataeans also, in defense of their lives in 427, pleaded that they had come to Sparta's assistance with Cimon in 464 (Thuc. iii. 54).

⁷Thuc. i. 101-2; CAH, V, 69-72.

allows his heroine to speak in exaggerated eulogy of Cimon's futile expedition, because the motive which prompted it is the one that he wishes to emphasize:

Do you not recall when the Laconian Pericleidas came here once and seated himself upon the altars, a suppliant of the Athenians, his face pale against his purple garment, and begged for an army? Then Messene was pressing you hard, and the god of quakes shaking you at the same time. But Cimon went with four thousand hoplites and saved the whole of Lacedaemon, and though you were treated thus by the Athenians, do you ravage the country from which you have reaped such benefits?¹

Turning next to the Athenians, Lysistrata recounts how once, when they wore the dress of slaves, they had been delivered from the tyrant Hippias and his numerous friends and mercenaries by the Laconians, who alone had fought beside them on that day and reclothed the demos in a cloak of freedom.²

The impression made by these well-chosen arguments upon the delegates is so telling that their remaining doubts and difficulties are easily resolved by friendly compromise, the nature of which we shall presently discuss. The amicable settlement is to be solemnized with oaths at a banquet,³ to which the chastened and repentant diplomats are now escorted. They are there regaled with a bounteous feast of goodfellowship prepared for them by the women,⁴ and presently return, the Athenians to declaim on the unsuspected geniality of the Laconians,⁵ and their own folly and guilt in the past in misrepresenting them,⁶ and the Spartans to chant a fervid ode to Memory, replete with the glowing Panhellenism of the Persian Wars:

Rouse the youths, O Mnemosyne, and my muse which knows of

¹Lys. 1138-46.

²Lys. 1149-56; Herod. v. 63-65; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 19.

³Lys. 1185.

⁴Lys. 1184.

⁵Lys. 1226.

⁶Lys. 1231-35.

us and the Athenians, when they at Artemisium fell upon the ships like gods and conquered the Medes, and us in turn Leonidas led like boars, I ween, sharpening their tusks. And foam in streams blossomed about our mouths, and foam in streams flowed down our limbs at the same time. For the Persian foemen were not fewer than the sands of the sea.¹

That the generous praise of Athens here put into Spartan mouths, had a more solid foundation than the poet's imagination we may infer from its repetition in Xenophon's account of the Spartan refusal to accede to the wishes of Corinth and Thebes to destroy Athens at the close of the war: "The Spartans said that they would not enslave a Greek city that had acquitted itself well in the greatest dangers that had befallen Greece."² The play ends on this triumphant note of patriotic goodwill, followed by invocations to the principal gods of Sparta and Athens, among whom Athena is noticeably prominent.³ Worshipped in both cities under special local epithets, her name provides an element of unity in the religious sanctions of the reconciliation which has just been celebrated.

The recommendation to reconciliation, again in this play, as in the Acharnians⁴ and the Peace,⁵ is reinforced by contrast with the counter-motive of traditional antipathy between Sparta and Athens. These outcroppings of jealousy, suspicion, or antagonism among the characters of the drama reflect the difficulties and impediments in the field of real politics. The scenic representation of Lysistrata overcoming opposition of the sort that everyone knew to exist renders her final diplomatic success more convincing, and encourages the audience to believe that what has been demonstrated on the stage can be repeated off it.

Illustrations of the motive of conflict can be found

¹Lys. 1247-61. ²Xen. Hell. 11. 2. 20. ³Lys. 1321.

⁴Ach. 308, 509-11.

⁵Pax 623, 1064-86.

throughout the play. The response of the women of Athens to Lysistrata's first gloomy prophecy of the total extinction of the Peloponnesians is one of instantaneous approval.¹ The counter-chorus of old men would as soon trust a snarling wolf as they would trust Laconians,² whom they suspect of being the real instigators of the women's conspiracy.³ They boast how, in one good old days, they sent Cleomenes packing when, like the women now, he had attempted to hold the Acropolis against them.⁴ Athenian suspicion is matched by Spartan distrust. With laconic frankness, Lampito asks how anyone could possibly persuade the fickle mob of Athenians not to make fools of themselves.⁵ She is equally ingenuous in her instinctive Spartan fear of Athenian wealth and naval power.⁶ On these points she is immediately reassured, as we have shown, and even the defiant counter-chorus succumbs finally to the gentler advances of its female contemporaries. The change from ferocity to complacency is so extreme that when choral harmony has been established, the men listen without protest to the women's proposal to entertain some fine gentlemen from Carystos.⁷ The characterization of these Carystians as "fine gentlemen," which in its political sense indicates aristocratic partisanship,⁸ though that can scarcely be the meaning here, by a strange coincidence was justified a few months later when

¹Lys. 33-34. ²Lys. 629; cf. Ach. 308. ³Lys. 620-25.

⁴Lys. 274-80; Herod. v. 72; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 20.

⁵Lys. 170-71. ⁶Lys. 173-74. ⁷Lys. 1058-60.

⁸The epithet applied here to the Carystians is ἄνδρες καλοὺς τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς. καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ is commonly used by Greek writers, like optimates or omnes boni in Roman usage, as a technical expression in political terminology to indicate the "upper classes" or citizens of aristocratic or oligarchic sympathies. It is so used in Thuc. viii. 48. 6 and in Frogs 719 and 728. An excellent discussion of the political connotation of these moral terms is given in Appendix II of R. A. Neill's edition of the Knights to which more extensive reference is made infra.

three hundred armed Carystians supported the oligarchic revolutionists at Athens.¹

These incidental expressions of ill-feeling serve their dramatic purpose. They add a touch of realism to the play. But Aristophanes is not content with mere casual reminders of temperamental differences which cannot resist an honest attempt at reconciliation.² Neither is he satisfied with Lysistrata's admirable object-lesson in the gentler methods of diplomacy. He considers it necessary to point out in so many words that Athenian diplomats are neither honest nor desirous of reconciliation. Masking his attack behind a screen of convivial hilarity, which serves the double purpose of mercifully hiding the embarrassment of the sinners and of affording their confession the protection of irresponsibility, he endows the Athenian revellers with the unusual merit of truth-telling:

We are not in our right senses when we are sober. If I shall succeed in persuading the Athenians, we will always go on embassies everywhere drunk. For now whenever we go to Sparta sober, we immediately look around to see what trouble we can cause, so that whatever they say, we do not hear, and what they do not say, that we suspect. And we do not report the same things about the same things.³

Lack of sincerity is incompatible with reconciliation, as the disillusioned banqueters now realize and admit, but their open avowal of guilt in the past and their determination to adopt a more friendly attitude on future embassies removes the last doubt of their sincerity and creates an atmosphere in which peace can thrive. In the complete concord, therefore, and cordial recon-

¹Thuc. viii. 69. The principal reason, of course, why Carystians are mentioned here is because their name suggests an obscene pun. Cf. Van Leeuwen's note on *Lys.* 1058 and the scholiast ad. loc. Gilbert (*Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens* [Leipzig, 1877], p. 307) thinks that the Carystians in question were oligarchic partisans and infers from the *Lysistrata* that they had been in Athens for some time before the outbreak of the revolution.

²*Lys.* 1112.

³*Lys.* 1228-35.

ciliation of the final scene, we are not surprised to find Athenians renouncing their dislike for Spartans,¹ and Spartans praying to Artemis to cure them of their foxlike ways.² The purpose of the conference is fulfilled when the delegates plight their faith to Hesychia, spirit of kindly thoughts.³

Though it is not the function of the poet to discuss the prosaic details of politics in a comedy, he makes it sufficiently clear that the will to be reconciled must have a practical manifestation in an attempt at compromise.⁴ A spirit of give and take must prevail between the parties at variance if they are to settle their differences. Aristophanes merely offers a few illustrative suggestions to point the way to the compromise which must be worked out by properly accredited representatives of the powers concerned. Even his illustrations are so involved with the comic factor of double entente, that it is impossible to decide how seriously he meant them. There is, however, no doubt about the principle that is to govern the negotiating parties in making such concessions as are necessary. Each must withdraw from positions that threaten the integrity of the other's power. In the case of Athens, this means the evacuation of Pylus.⁵ It is the only demand that Aristophanes attributes to Sparta. Since the opening of the play, the audience has been prepared for the suggestion by the complaint of the wife whose husband has been separated from her for seven whole months while performing military service at Pylus.⁶ She, at least, would not be sorry to be rid of Pylus. The Athenians simulate reluctance,⁷ but their mentor had read the

¹Lys. 1226.

²Lys. 1268.

³Lys. 1289; cf. 1224.

⁴Lys. 1167.

⁵Lys. 1163-64.

⁶Lys. 104.

⁷Lys. 1165.

writing on the wall. The year before, economy had compelled them to evacuate their fortress in Laconia,¹ and, two years after, Pylus was lost through the indifference or incompetence of Anytus who was sent to relieve it.² Sparta, in her turn, must withdraw from the neighborhood of the Malian Gulf,³ which Agis had conquered in the winter of 413-412.⁴ His maneuver had rendered more precarious the Athenian possession of Euboea.⁵ We know from Thucydides that Athens, at this time, was filled with anxiety about Euboea⁶ which was meditating revolt, and had entered into treasonable correspondence with Agis.⁷ Furthermore, the operations of Agis had given him control of the land route to the north⁸ and suggested a repetition of the mischief which Brasidas had wrought in Chalcidice.⁹ Spartan interference in this direction would be wholly inconsistent with any friendship between the two cities. Even the women seem to be sensitive about the poor success which has attended upon Athenian generalship in Thrace. One of them throws out a scornful hint that there is more likelihood that Eucrates himself needs to be watched than there is reason to expect him to watch his country's interests effectively.¹⁰ The territory to be restored

¹Thuc. vii. 26; viii. 4; CAH, V, 313. This fortified position in Laconia as Classen says (note, in his edition on Thuc. vii. 26. 2) cannot certainly be identified but is probably the Onugnathus mentioned by Pausanias (iii. 22. 10). Thucydides merely describes it as a place shaped like an isthmus opposite Cythera where there is a temple of Apollo.

²Aristotle Ath. Pol. 27; Xen. Hell. i. 2. 18; Diodorus xiii. 64. Pylus was lost in the spring of 409. Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1553.

³Lys. 1168-70. ⁴Thuc. viii. 3. ⁵Cf. Thuc. iii. 92. 4.

⁶Thuc. viii. 1; cf. iii. 93. 1 and viii. 96.

⁷Thuc. viii. 5. ⁸Thuc. iii. 92. 4. ⁹Thuc. iv. 81.

¹⁰Lys. 103. This Eucrates is generally supposed by editors to be the brother of Nicias (Andocides i. 47; Lysias xviii. 4 ff.) and to have been succeeded in his Thracian command during the present year by Diitrephes (Thuc. viii. 64).

to the Athenian sphere of influence includes the town of Echinus¹ which is doubly desirable, both because of its geographical location, and because its equivocal name suggests to the delegates in addition the possibility of satisfying their longing for Diallage.

Thus far, the suggested compromise shows a lively appreciation of the political situation, but when Aristophanes throws the Megarian Legs² into the scale for Athens, one wonders whether he himself has not compromised with his original principles. It is true that Athens had retained Nisaea by the terms of the Peace of Nicias,³ but that fact had been one of the causes of dissatisfaction with the peace. Aristophanes' own ideal thirty years' treaty had included the return of Nisaea to Megara.⁴ In this final detail, it seems likely that the author had a different purpose, the key to which is announced in the adjuration: "Do not dispute about legs!"⁵ The criticism is meant as much for Athens as for Sparta, and is intended to deprecate too meticulous bargaining. Both in the Acharnians⁶ and the Peace,⁷ the Megarian embargo had been blamed as the cause of war. Megara had long been a debatable

¹Lys. 1169. Paulmier's note, in spite of Roger's protest (note on Lys. 1169), is most discerning and just: "Nam ea potissimum loca repetunt Athenienses, quae erant ad maris imperium opportuna, quippe id affectantes." Blaydes quotes the note and adds: "Hunc locum docte explicuit Palmerius." Cf. Thuc. iii. 92, 93. Wilamowitz, like Rogers, does not appreciate the point, for he says of Echinus: "Die Gegend hatte politisch gar keine Bedeutung und geringen wirtschaftlichen Wert." Echinus is situated on the northern shore of the Malian Gulf near its entrance, diagonally across from Thermopylae, and is in a position to command both the inner and outer straits at the northern end of Euboea, and to protect that island itself from attack from the mainland.

²Lys. 1170.

³Thuc. v. 17. Nisaea was still in Athenian hands but was lost soon after Pylus in 409 (Diodorus xiii. 65; CAH, V, 347; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1554).

⁴Thuc. i. 115.

⁵Lys. 1172.

⁶Ach. 530 ff.

⁷Pax 609.

ground between Athens and Sparta. In this remark, Aristophanes gives himself a final opportunity to urge that Megara and her walls and port be allowed no longer to disturb the peace of Greece. The mere mention of Megarian Legs by the Athenians is a pathological symptom of vestigial recalcitrance, and their demand is meant to illustrate the long pursuit of wrong ambition and inveterate error which Lysistrata now finally succeeds in eradicating.

There is another reason why Aristophanes may have been careless about the interests of Megara in this play. It is noteworthy that, whereas here and there concern has been expressed for the condition of Boeotia and the Peloponnese as a whole;¹ whereas the avowed purpose of Lysistrata is to save the whole of Greece;² whereas she bases her hope of success upon the adherence of the noble Boeotian, Ismenia, as well as upon the stalwart Lampito;³ whereas she insists upon the allies of Sparta being associated in the negotiations⁴ (it was their fault that the last peace had been a failure⁵); nevertheless, the actual compromise and reconciliation is effected between plenipotentiaries of Athens and Sparta alone. When Lysistrata cautiously divulges to her assembled confederates the awful sacrifice that must be paid as the price of peace, it is Lampito alone who has the initiative and courage to declare herself a full partner in the enterprise;⁶ it is Lampito alone who earns the unique compliment from her leader: "O dearest friend, my one true friend of all."⁷ Subsequent events prove her as good as her word. The appeal of Lysistrata is significant: "But my dear Laconian, if you alone side with me, we might yet

¹Lys. 33, 35, 40, 75, 995-96, 1077.

²Lys. 29-30, 41, 342, 525.

³Lys. 696-97. ⁴Lys. 1177; cf. 995.

⁵Thuc. v. 22, 25, etc. ⁶Lys. 142-44. ⁷Lys. 145.

save the situation. Do but vote with me!"¹ The other women merely wait upon the decision of Lysistrata and Lampito, as one of them testifies by her use of the dual number of the pronoun: "If this is verily the decision of you twain, we also are agreed."² Lampito, likewise, is loudest in her approval of the oath which binds them to the plot.³ Later on, when the success of the project is assured and the Spartan ambassadors have arrived, the chorus rejoices: "The first of the Greeks, captivated by your charm, have submitted to you, and referred their grievances to you in common."⁴ There is a strong indication in the tenor of these passages that the poet is still a supporter of the policy which he enunciated in the Peace,⁵ and an advocate of the dual leadership of Athens and Sparta. The real compromise underlying his semi-humorous illustrations is essentially recognition by Sparta of Athens' naval hegemony and renunciation by Athens of her ambitions to compete with Sparta for power on the mainland. With this point settled, the other members of the Peloponnesian League and the island cities for whom Athens speaks must inevitably agree. Their agreement is taken for granted in the play. When Lysistrata has persuaded both Spartan and Athenian delegates to accept the compromise, she adds: "Well, if you have decided to do this, go and communicate your plans and take counsel with your allies." "Allies indeed, my dear!" exclaims the Athenian. "We are eager. Will not the allies be of the same mind as we, to enjoy themselves one and all?" The Laconian adds corroboration, "Ours will at any rate, by the heavenly twins!" "Yes, by Jove, and so will the Carystians,"⁶ continues the irrepressible Athenian, referring to the same fine gentlemen whom the Athenian ladies had proposed to

¹Lys. 140-42.

²Lys. 167.

³Lys. 198.

⁴Lys. 1110-11.

⁵Pax 1080-82.

⁶Lys. 1176-81.

entertain, and whose ready acquiescence in taking orders from their masters proved so inconvenient in the following May. The last intimation of the dual character of this reconciliation is given by the Spartans who prelude their joyous recessional with a dedication to "ourselves and the Athenians."¹ The rehearsal of their joint exploits, however, contains no reference to the domestic incidents of which Lysistrata reminded them, but is devoted entirely to their valiant defense against the Persians.²

Aristophanes was both a realist and an idealist. Realism led him to divide the leadership of the Greek world between Athens and Sparta. It needed no great perspicacity to see that a free Hellas could not survive the destruction of one by the other. He desired them to co-operate against the hereditary foes of the Hellenic race, and only so could his ideal be realized. Thus the dualism that Lysistrata takes such pains to manipulate is intended to serve the end of Panhellenism. She makes no attempt to conceal it. The safety of the whole of Greece is her constant motive. Greek safety was threatened by two great dangers, internal division, and weakening external defense. Each tended to exaggerate the other. The foreign menace became ever greater as Greeks continued to cripple each other. The Persian peril, which receives some attention in the Acharnians³ and in the Peace,⁴ was more acute when the Lysistrata was written because of the recent Treaty of Miletus, and the policies of which it was the result. That Aristophanes realized the true significance of Persian encouragement of Greek quarrels is proved by his mingled indignation and lament in a passage which we have already discussed: "Though barbarian foes are at hand with an army, you destroy men and cities

¹Lys. 1244; cf. 1250.

²Lys. 1251-61.

³Ach. 62-129.

⁴Pax, 108, 406-8.

of Hellas."¹ It has been pointed out, also, that this passage admits of the meaning that the efforts at mutual destruction might better be turned into a united effort to destroy the barbarians. The passage formed part of Lysistrata's rebuke to the ambassadors who had submitted to her pacification. If we may seek the intention of the lesson in its effect, there can be no doubt of the Panhellenic purpose of the reconciliation. Athenian diplomacy and Athenian hospitality under the skilful direction of Lysistrata have at least succeeded in reminding Spartans of one thing, the unanimity which once prevailed when they co-operated against Persia, at Artemisium and Thermopylae.²

Besides the reconciliation, which is the work of Lysistrata, there is a concurrent reconciliation between the semi-choruses,³ from which we may gather supporting evidence. The women are crusaders in the cause of peace. The men are filled with militant zeal to stamp out treachery and conspiracy. Masculine valor is inspired by the trophy at Marathon,⁴ while feminine knavery is envisaged by male eyes as either operating in the interests of Hippias,⁵ or as masquerading in the guise of Artemisia,⁶ both of whom were notorious examples of Medism.⁷ There is even some suggestion that the women are babbling about a brazen shield⁸ which again recalls the treacherous signal of Marathon.⁹ They are

¹Supra, p. 16 ff; Lys. 1133-34.

²Lys. 1250-61.

³Lys. 1040-42.

⁴Lys. 285.

⁵Lys. 619.

⁶Lys. 675.

⁷For the Medism of Hippias vide Herod. v. 96; vi. 102, 107-9. For Artemisia vide Herod. vii. 99; viii. 68-69, 87-88.

⁸Lys. 627.

⁹Herod. vi. 115, 121-24. J. Wells ("Aristophanes and Herodotus," Studies in Herodotus [Oxford, 1923], p. 182) holds that the allusions in Aristophanes' Birds indicate a special interest in the work of Herodotus at Athens in and after 414. This reference to a brazen shield in connection with the women, who are charged with conspiracy, may be a similar indication, or it

equally accused of connivance with Sparta,¹ but there need be no contradiction there since Sparta was doing nothing else but betraying Greeks to Persia at Miletus. Fortunately, however, the stout old gentlemen are mistaken in their judgment of women. It is the women who aid them to discover the cause of the trouble, a Tricorysian gnat,² offspring indeed of Marathonian swamps,³ but not of women's hatching. By women's aid it is removed, and in the united chorus, we have again a union of the two motives. One is the pacific crusade of the women which does, as the men discerned, involve co-operation with Sparta. The other is the Marathonian patriotism of the men, now guided by women's diplomacy out of the wrong channel of antagonizing Sparta, into the right course of aligning Sparta with themselves against Persia.

may simply be a reminiscence of the shield story independent of its repetition by Herodotus. Some scholars have denied the existence of any such signal and attributed the story to the too active imagination of those who feared treason, e.g., H. Delbrück, Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege (Berlin, 1887), pp. 52-81. T. R. Glover (Herodotus [Berkeley, 1924], pp. 240-41) is inclined to this view. Most, however, accept the signal as a fact, though observing various degrees of caution in identifying the culprit who gave it. G. B. Grundy, The Great Persian War (London, 1901), p. 191, says: "The details of the shield incident hardly admit of discussion. The incident itself is obviously a historical fact." A. Hauvette, Hérodote, historien des guerres médiques (Paris, 1894), p. 267, says: "Nous admettons donc qu'un signal fut donné aux Perses par un émissaire des partisans d'Hippias." W. W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus (Oxford, 1912), II, 359-61, believe the Alcmaeonidae as capable of the treason as any partisan of Hippias. It may be objected that the mention of a shield here (Lys. 627) merely refers back to the women's oath and the suggestion to swear upon a shield (Lys. 185, 188, 190), but that suggestion was rejected, and the women really used a cup (Lys. 195) and not a shield. In any case, since the men and women have separated, the men can scarcely have heard the details of the oath ceremony. Their wild guesses as to the nature of the conspiracy proclaim their total ignorance.

¹Lys. 620, 628-29.

²Lys. 1032.

³Tricorythus was one of the villages of the Marathonian tetrapolis mentioned above. (Lys. 285; Diodorus iv. 57.) The district was haunted by gnats (Av. 244-46). The principal reason for the choice of name is the obscene pun again as in Lys. 1058 and 1181. Cf. Van Leeuwen's note ad loc.

As an incidental and minor motive, propaganda for unrestricted trade between Greek cities, so much more prominent in the Acharnians,¹ Wasps,² and Peace,³ is not wholly lost sight of in the Lysistrata. The old ladies of the chorus have a grievance:

Yesterday, too, when I was making a feast for Hecate, I invited from our neighbors as playmate for my children a fine and lovely maid from Boeotia--an eel; but they refused to send her because of your decrees. And you will never give up these decrees, until someone takes you by the leg and wrings your neck.⁴

If, in the warning of the last line, "leg" refers to the long walls to Peiraeus, Lysander may be said to have done the "wringing" at the end of the war when all democratic decrees ceased for a time. However that may be, there is no doubt that beneath its buffoonery, this speech condemns the prohibition by decree of the importation of goods from Boeotia.⁵ Whether the decrees referred to were passed as war measures, or were the expression of an ancient economic nationalism, they were equally objectionable to the propagandist of Panhellenism.

¹Ach. 623-25, 719-22.

²Vesp. 1161-62.

³Pax 999-1005.

⁴Lys. 700-705.

⁵Cf. Croiset, op. cit., p. 141, note 3.

PART II

LYSISTRATA'S POLITICAL ALLEGORY:

THE POLICY ENUNCIATED

A. The Allegory

The elaborate simile of the carded fleece and civic web is so pregnant with meaning that it must be given a detailed examination.¹ Stung by the stupidity and scorn of the Probulus, Lysistrata launches into a concise but pointed exposition of some of the more essential improvements required in the Athenian administration, thus:

Why if you yourselves had any wit, you would manage all the affairs of state after the fashion of our wool-working. First, as though washing out the filth from a fleece in a bath, you ought to beat out the rascals from the city, stretching it² on a table, and pick off the burrs, and, as for those who band and knot themselves together for the control of office, you should card them thoroughly and pluck off their heads; then into a wool basket of common goodwill, you should card one and all, mingling well both metics and any stranger or friend of yours, and if some owe debts to the state, you should mix them in too; and yes, by Zeus, even the cities, all that are colonies of this land, you must see that they are our wool-flocks as it were, lying separate and apart; then, taking the wool-flock from all these, you should bring it together here and gather it into a unit, and then make a great clew and from it weave a cloak for the Demos.³

¹This it has not received from editors and critics of Aristophanes. Commentators have contented themselves with general interpretations, which in some cases have fallen wide of the mark, or with the explanation of specific points whose real bearing can only be seen in a complete exposition.

²Adopting Van Leeuwen's suggestion to supply a participle from l. 732.

³Lys. 572-86. I have here translated the text of Hall and Geldart, Aristophanis Comoediae, Tom. II, Lysistrata ("Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis"; Oxonii, c. 1907), except that in l. 579, I have adopted the punctuation of Rogers which is supported by Blaydes' note in his apparatus criticus.

B. Domestic Reform

The prescription is comprehensive and intended as a cure for both local and imperial misgovernment. Domestic reform is first discussed, wherein the political independence of Aristophanes is left beyond dispute. He censures alike the evils of democracy and oligarchy. He would banish both sycophant and club. The identity of neither faction is left in doubt. In Aristophanes, as elsewhere, the term mochtheros is, in a political context, almost peculiarly an epithet of sycophants, demagogues, and extreme democrats.¹ In the Acharnians, lines 517-19, its connotation is explicitly "sycophants." In the Knights, line 1304, it is applied to Hyperbolus, the notorious demagogue.² These are the rascally burrs which must be clubbed out of the state, and that not for domestic reasons alone. They prick not Athens only, but her neighbors also. In a later play, the Plutus, one of the characters, a Just Man, exclaims after a brush with a sycophant: "By Zeus, the Savior, the god [Plutus] is of great value to all the Greeks because he will bring the bad sycophants to a bad end."³

¹In Lys. 1160, mochtheria connotes the democratic war policy. In Ran. 425, it describes the activities of demagogues. In Ran. 1011, mochtherotatus is the term applied to the disciples of Euripides. R. A. Neil, The Knights of Aristophanes (Cambridge, 1901), Appendix II, pp. 206-7, emphatically supports my interpretation of Lys. 576, and gives a complete discussion of the political connotation of mochtheros. He shows that poneros is much the commoner term to express the same idea. "The social and political use of poneros and mochtheros as opposed to kalos kagathos or chrestos appears chiefly from 430 to 350 B.C. . . . Clear cases in Aristophanes of poneros are: Eq. 181, 186, 336, 415; Nub. 102; Pax 684; Ran. 731; Plut. 920." Cf. L. Whibley, Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1889), p. 48.

²Hyperbolus is called mochtheros in Thuc. viii. 73. Plutarch says that his reputation was so unsavory that after his ostracism the institution fell into disuse (Nic. 11). Cf. H.A. Holden, Onomastikon Aristophaneum (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1902), s.v. "Hyperbolus."

³Plut. 877-79.

A favorite weapon of the demagogue is the popular decree, of which the assembly produces a plenteous crop at their instigation, thereby rousing resentment at home and abroad. "For you will not have power [to harm us], not even if you pass decrees seven times over, wretch, that are hated by all your fellows and your neighbors too."¹ The neighbor in immediate question is Boeotia, and the reference is a reminiscence of a point more fully developed in the Acharnians.² Lysistrata's first remedy is the elimination of the imperialistic irritant, the shoddy in the civic fleece, the chief obstacle to Panhellenic concord.

The succeeding item of reform surely refutes those critics who would describe our poet as the spokesman of the oligarchic party.³ There is a close verbal resemblance between the present description, "those who band and knot themselves together for the control of office," and the statement of Thucydides that "Peisander visited all the clubs which chanced previously to exist in the city for the control of courts and officials, and exhorted them to unite and, by taking common counsel, to overthrow the democracy."⁴ The same sinister connection between Peisander and the oligarchic clubs is alluded to by Aristophanes earlier in this play. "For those who aim at controlling office from time to time kept stirring up some tumult in order that Peisander might be able to steal

¹Lys. 698-99, 703-4.

²Cf. Ach. 532, 821, 912-13.

³Cf. H. Müller-Strübing, Aristophanes und die historische Kritik (Leipzig, 1873), p. 105; A. Couat, Aristophane et l'ancienne comédie attique (3d ed.; Paris, 1902), pp. 33-54; Eduard Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums (Stuttgart und Berlin, 1915), IV², 375-78.

⁴Thuc. viii. 54. The translation here given is that of C. F. Smith in the Loeb Classical Library, but the Greek is really untranslatable. The Thucydidean phrase ἐπὶ δίκαις καὶ ἀρχαῖς might better be paraphrased, as Professor Bonner suggests: "for mutual support in politics and litigation" or "for law-suits and elections." The words used by Lysistrata (l. 578) are ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς.

something."¹ The clubs were nuclei of conspiracy and revolution, tangled knots in the good fleece of citizenship. If the heads or knots were plucked off, the wool could be carded straight again, and the rank and file of the membership rewoven into the regular civic pattern. Calhoun believes that "here is no reference to clubs of any particular party, least of all to secret and stealthy conspiracies of the extreme oligarchs."² But this interpretation takes too little account of the energetic activities of the said oligarchs. Following the usual tactics employed, for example, by Ephialtes against the Areopagus,³ and by the Thirty against the democratic irreconcilables,⁴ Antiphon and his colleagues at this time were busy with a series of prosecutions intended to destroy the prestige of the government.⁵ The clubs constituted the most

¹Lys. 490; cf. Lysias xxv. 9.

²Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation (Austin, 1913), pp. 20-21.

³Aristotle Ath. Pol. 25. ⁴Lysias xiii. 17, et passim.

⁵Antiphon in Oratio vi. 12, 35, 50 refers to a series of prosecutions in which his client only a few months before (vi. 41 ff) has attacked various ex-magistrates for embezzlement during their term of office. To this series of prosecutions belongs another speech of Antiphon, now lost, the Contra Philinum, written for the same client for the prosecution of one of the men mentioned in vi. 12, 35. It is generally agreed that these prosecutions constituted an organized attack of the oligarchs upon the democratic administration. Cf. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Aristoteles und Athen (Berlin, 1893), II, 347: "der grosse redner, das geistige haupt der umsturzpartei, stellte seine kunst in dem dienst der demagogen, welche angeblich oder vielleicht wirklich die unterschliefe der beamten, der vertrauensmänner des volkes, an das licht zogen." There is disagreement, however, in regard to the date of Oratio vi and consequently of the prosecutions mentioned. Some refer them to the eve of the revolution in 412 and others refer them back to 425 when Cleon's increase of the tribute is likely to have provoked opposition. But even those who favor 425 as the date, regard the prosecutions as an early and integral part of the oligarchic campaign which culminated in the revolution of 411. Even if Oratio vi and the particular prosecutions referred to in it belong to 425, a fortiori a similar method of attack was used by the revolutionists against the administration in 412-411.

The reference in a fragment of the Contra Philinum (No. 61, Thalheim) to making hoplites of all thetes seems to fit best in

effective and best organized opposition to an administration in power, as, we are told, Thucydides, the son of Milesias, was not slow to recognize.¹ It was the nature of a club to conspire;² the democratic regime had been long; and so it was inevitable that the clubs should have become predominantly oligarchic.³ The fact that Aristophanes almost always represents them as oligarchic⁴ is a testimony both to their character and to his independence of

the emergency following the disaster in Sicily. And the fact that the Poristai of Oratio vi are mentioned elsewhere only in Aristophanes' Frogs 1505 would seem to favor the view that this magistracy was another emergency device and that Oratio vi belongs to 412.

The latter date is accepted by R. C. Jebb, The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus (2nd ed.; London, 1893), I, 62; L. Gernet, Antiphon Discours (Paris, 1923), pp. 137-41; Wilamowitz, loc. cit.; and Rudolf Schoell, "De extraordinariis quibusdam magistratibus Atheniensium," Commentationes philologae in honorem T. Mommseni (Berlin, 1877), p. 455. Blass and Lipsius are non-committal (F. Blass, Die attische Beredsamkeit [2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1887-98], I, 195-96; Antiphon Orationes [2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1892], p. xlvii; and J. H. Lipsius, Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren [Leipzig, 1915], p. 48, n. 145). On the other hand, Bruno Keil ("Das System des Kleisthenischen Staatskalendars," Hermes XXIX [1894], pp. 339-40) argues for 425 as the date and his view is accepted by Georg Busolt, Griechische Geschichte (Gotha, 1893-1904), III, Part II, 1405, n. 2. K. J. Beloch, however, argues that Keil's careful reasoning is based upon false premises and that his conclusions fall to the ground (Griechische Geschichte [Strassburg, 1912-14], II, Part II, sec. 97, pp. 231-32).

¹Plut. Per. 11. Calhoun, op. cit., p. 19, n. 2, distinguishes between the club and the party organization, but the former must have been the basis of the latter.

²Thuc. iii. 82: "Such associations are not entered into for the public good in conformity with the prescribed laws, but for selfish aggrandisement contrary to the established laws" (trans. C. F. Smith).

³Cf. Cambridge Ancient History (New York, 1927), V, 324; Jebb, op. cit., I, 8: "The tone of such clubs would always be, in a general way, antipopular."

⁴Eq. 257, 452, 476-78, 628, 862; Vesp. 345, 483, 488, 507, 953; Lys. 1153; cf. Gustav Gilbert, Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens (Leipzig, 1877), pp. 84-85. On the other hand, in Vesp. 1219-48 we have what appears to be an extended reference to a club or coterie of Cleon and his friends. There can hardly be any technical significance in the use of the word hetairon in Pax 1132. Trygaeus is a rustic.

that party. The oligarchic affiliation of the clubs is further to be inferred from the specific assertion of Thucydides that Peisander visited them all, and urged them to unite to overthrow the democracy. If any had been democratic in sympathy, surely, he would have passed them by.

There is also, as Gilbert observes, in the passage under consideration an antithetical juxtaposition of terms which suggests that the reference is to the two chief political parties respectively. Aristophanes does not name the heads that are meet for the plucking, but in earlier plays there are possible hints that he recognized their identity. Most modern editors deny that the convivial guests of Philoctemon in Wasps, lines 1250 and 1301-2, are the more famous bearers of the names there given, but it is suggestive that an Antiphon and a Phrynichus, namesakes of the men whom Thucydides selects as the choice spirits of the reactionary party, should already be grouped in questionable affinity by Aristophanes in 422.¹ The identity is not certain; yet, who shall set the limits of Aristophanic allusion?

We are nearer certainty in regard to Diitrephes, the

¹Müller-Strübing, op. cit., pp. 708-9, holds that the host is Antiphon, called Philoctemon presumably because of his alleged miserliness (cf. Philostratus Lives of the Sophists i. 15, and Pseudo-Plutarch Life of Antiphon 16), and that in addition to Phrynichus, Thucydides the historian is included in the oligarchic circle under the nickname Hippiylus. Gilbert, Beiträge, p. 309, likewise, believes that the Antiphon at whose hunger Aristophanes scoffs, may be the great orator who composed speeches for money. Starkie admits it as a probability. Van Leeuwen and Rogers scout the idea. The description of the guests as kaloí kagathoi (l. 1256) and of one of them as a parasite of the well-to-do (l. 1318) suggests an oligarchic club, and the threat of an organized legal vengeance (ll. 1332-34) reminds us of the tactics of Antiphon. Keil, whose studies in the Attic calendar lead him to date Antiphon's sixth speech in 425, identifies the Lysistratus of Antiphon Oratio vi. 36 with the Lysistratus of Wasps 1302 (op. cit., p. 339). His dating of Antiphon's speech pushes the oligarchical conspiracy against the democratic government back far enough to leave him no doubt that the names grouped with Antiphon's in the Wasps are those of the members of an oligarchic club.

trader-warrior, whose meteoric rise from maker of wicker flasks to phylarch and hipparch is crowned by the poet's wit with the expressive epithet, "tawny horsecock."¹ Diitrephes became a name in barber shops, the germ of a horse-fever which demoralized the fashionable youth and their fathers' purses.² For this he deserved censure in the Birds, but, soon after, his evil influence transcended the boundaries of Attica and gave far greater justification for the poet's prophetic antipathy. He was in command of the barbarians who massacred the helpless village of Mycalessus.³ Still later, in connivance with the authors of the oligarchic revolution, he forced Thasos and others of the Thrace-ward cities to exchange democracy for oligarchy and, in so doing, hastened the dissolution of the crumbling Athenian empire.

About two months, however, after his departure the Thasians fortified their city, feeling that they no longer had any need of an aristocracy attached to Athens, and daily looking for freedom to be given them by the Lacedaimonians In Thasos, then, the result was the opposite of what the Athenians who were establishing the oligarchy there desired, and it was the same, as it seems to me, in many others of the subject states; for the cities, having acquired soberness of spirit and immunity in carrying out their designs, aimed at downright freedom, caring nothing for the hollow sham of law and order offered by the Athenians.⁴

Whether or not the Diitrephes of the Thracian misadventure is the same as the tawny horsecock of the Birds--and there seems insufficient reason for doubting it⁵--at any rate, the activities of the

¹Av. 798-800.

²Av. 1440-43; cf. Nub. 74.

³Thuc. vii. 29, 30.

⁴Thuc. viii. 64, trans. C. F. Smith.

⁵Because Pausanias says (i. 23. 3) that he saw the statue of Diitrephes pierced with arrows, and, in the same context, relates the story of Mycalessus, it has been assumed by some that he fell there in 413 (e.g., Holden, op. cit., s.v. "Diitrephes"). But there is no positive assertion to that effect, and Goodhart (ad Thuc. viii. 64) and Van Leeuwen (ad Av. 31) believe that he lived to take part in the revolution of 411.

emissary of oligarchy throw great light upon the poet's wish to pluck off the heads of the clubs. He had two reasons. He disapproved of gratuitous interference in the local affairs of the allies, and he was opposed to the estrangement of the cities that formed the empire, once the Delian League.

Yet another politician, who took an active part in the revolution of the Four Hundred,¹ had in 414 already won the animosity of Aristophanes for his oligarchic sympathies.

Hoopoe: Apparently you are looking for an aristocracy.

Euelpides: I? Not by any means. Why, I even abominate the son of Scelias.²

Aristocrates, almost as adroit as Theramenes, remained in the political saddle through the changes from Four Hundred to Five Thousand to restored democracy, and fell a victim to popular unreason and superior intrigue with the other victors of Arginusae.³ In 412, when Aristophanes must have been busy with the composition of the Lysistrata, he was sent as general to prevent the revolt of Chios, but his intervention was no more happy in its sequel than that of Diitrephes in Thasos.⁴

The view that the oligarchic clubs are here the object of censure is confirmed by the artistic treatment of the plot. That Aristophanes was not unaware of the meaning of the political intrigue operating behind the scenes is a certain inference from

¹Thuc. viii. 89, 92.

²Av. 125-26. Cf. Whibley, *op. cit.*, p. 98: "He also attacks individual oligarchs, in cases where the motive of his attack seems political, Aves 126 (Aristocrates)." B.W.Henderson, The Great War between Athens and Sparta (London, 1927), pp. 490-91, regards Aristocrates as a member of the middle party with Theramenes and Alcibiades, basing his view on three passages: Xen. Hell. i. 4. 21; Thuc. viii. 89; and Lysias xii. 66.

³Thuc. v. 19, 24; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 33; Lysias xii. 66; Demos. lviii. 67; Plato Gorgias 472 B; Xen. Hell. i. 7. 2.

⁴Thuc. viii. 9. Later, with Alcibiades, he attempted to put down a revolt in Andros (Xen. Hell. i. 4. 21).

one conspicuous feature of the action. In a sense, the whole play is a burlesque¹ of the conspiracy which culminated in the overthrow of the democratic constitution. Aristophanes knew of the oligarchic plot and its objective, which he regarded as a national calamity; he, therefore, cleverly anticipated the plotters, appropriated their strategy for a very different purpose, and developed an intrigue, not for the benefit of a faction, but for the salvation of Hellas and, incidentally, of his own city. And what is the artistic function of the semi-chorus of old men, but to expose and explain this idea of the poet's as it develops from the beginning to the end of the play? The old men are typical and traditional democrats; they are treated as well-meaning but misguided patriots.² They speak in tones very like those of the old dicasts in the Wasps.³ Any poet that represents these sturdy fellows in so favorable a light must have been a man of the people, and no aristocrat or oligarch. They are chauvinistic, but show a healthy suspicion of plots.⁴ Their suspicions find expression in terms of Athenian history. They liken themselves to the White Feet, the stalwart defenders of Lepsydrium, whose mission it was

¹W. S. Ferguson (CAH, V, 325) agrees with this interpretation: "The burlesquing of Peisander's 'swindle' loses nothing by the more than Rabelaisian exploitation of the sexual situation to which the plot of the play invites."

²Lys. 1032. The Tricorysian gnat is a metaphor showing that the spirit of Marathon, or patriotic zeal, may lead to hasty judgment, so obscuring the vision as to cause true friends to be mistaken for enemies. Tricorythus was a member of the Tetrapolis.

³Lys. 624-25. They believe that their dicastic fee is the prize of contention, and that, therefore, the issue is political and that the women represent the opposition to democracy. The women themselves confirm this suspicion by saying: "You won't play the Heliast any longer" (Lys. 380). Cf. Rogers' notes on Lys. 614 and 624. Gilbert Norwood, Greek Comedy (London, 1931), p. 247, says: "They are--they must be--the same grumpy old fellows whom we met in the Wasps: here is Strymodorus again at any rate (Wasps 233. He has been mentioned in Ach. 273 also)."

⁴Lys. 263, 619; cf. 1007.

to deliver Athens from the tyranny of Hippias,¹ the friend of Persia. Like later tyrannicides, they scent tyranny and are moved with a desire to emulate the example of Aristogeiton. They regard the women who have seized the Acropolis, like Hippias, and Cleomones² after him, as now pro-Spartan,³ now pro-Persian,⁴ now Amazons.⁵ There is no consistency in the description; there is merely an atmosphere of distrust and danger, a situation which must be met in the spirit of Marathon.

But these women, hateful to Euripides and all gods, surely I shall not abide and endure for their colossal impudence? [If I do,] then no longer may my trophy be shown in the four towns [of Marathon's plain].⁶

The antagonism of the counter-chorus is inconsistent because it is unjustified. It must break down before the revelation of Lysistrata's true purpose. It is the achievement of Aristophanes in this play that the sterling citizens whom he would consider justly suspicious and antagonistic to plots and conspiracies with Persia, are shown to be reconciled and converted when the Panhellenic program of the women and its benefits become known. The old men are converted by having their honest doubts resolved.⁷ The burlesque of a conspiracy is meant to expose the conspiring clubs by stealing their main play; the purpose of the burlesque is exactly the opposite of that of Peisander and his confederates. Their plan was to gain the co-operation of Persia against Sparta.⁸ The plan of the Panhellenic poet was to gain some approach to civic and racial solidarity. He rallies his comic resources to defeat the forces of division, mainly represented at the moment

¹Lys. 616-35, 665; cf. scholiast.

²Lys. 274-82.

³Lys. 620.

⁴Lys. 675.

⁵Lys. 678.

⁶Lys. 283-85.

⁷Lys. 1022-47.

⁸Thuc. viii. 48, 53, 65.

by oligarchic endeavors to profit by democratic discomfiture in Sicily, and, eventually, by oligarchic hopes of office founded on Persian support. The comic conception of the conspiracy of women, first, by its revolutionary method¹ which deserves and receives the abuse and criticism of the counter-chorus, and then, by its pacific intent and successful reconciliation, shows Aristophanes at variance with the current of oligarchic policy at this period, and corroborates the view that line 578 of the simile is directed at the oligarchic clubs.²

The behavior of the women whose conspiracy is so thoroughly justified by the patriotic success which crowns their unusual tactics, meets with other and more deserved criticism than that of the chorus of men. Varium et mutabile semper! All are not as disinterested and steadfast as Lysistrata and Lampito. Only by stern reproof and ceaseless vigilance can the leader keep her ranks intact and her followers of one mind. She encourages the weaklings and admonishes the disloyal with reasoning that was peculiarly necessary in faction-torn Athens: "Endure with me yet a little while, for there is an oracle that we shall prevail if we do not yield to party strife."³ There may also be a note of regret for the dissension that hampered the army in its effectiveness in the cry of the men's chorus: "What one of the generals at Samos would seize the pike with me?"⁴ Burlesque, reproof, humor, chagrin, oracles, and sexual appeal, all are used with skill and

¹Lys. 175-79, 182, 237, 240-42, 260-65, 630, 673-75, 1007.

²Whibley, op. cit., pp. 98-99: "He had no sympathy with the oligarchs and was really loyal to the demos and eager for its prosperity There is no trace of anti-democratic feeling in his works. The Demos in the Equites is more sinned against than sinning." Cf. Maurice Croiset, Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens, trans. Jas. Loeb (London, 1909), pp. 136-37.

³Lys. 765-68.

⁴Lys. 313.

effect in the assault on stasis, the most insidious disease of the city state.¹

Proceeding with the formula, we next find an anticipation, though less explicit, of the famous advice of the Frogs, and we are justified in interpreting the present by the later passage because the circumstances that inspired both are similar, viz., the critical fortunes of a city, depleted of man-power, fighting desperately for national existence. Public debtors should be freed of their disabilities, and re-enfranchised, but, more significant from a Panhellenic point of view, common goodwill within the state should be obtained by the inclusion of metics and even loyal foreign residents among the citizens.

In the meticulously exact expressions of Frogs, lines 701-2, it is urged that all men who fight with Athens at sea should be welcomed as "kinsmen," as "fully franchised" and as "citizens." These words leave no question of a qualified or inferior type of citizenship. The newcomers are to receive not only political rights, but all the privileges that inhere in membership in a family. The language of the Frogs is less enigmatic than that of the Lysistrata because, in 405, a step had already been taken towards the proposed reform. The slaves had been rewarded for their valor at Arginusae. The poet's suggestion is not a novel idea. In 411, the same idea was not so familiar to his audience. He had not the same basis for confidence that it would be favorably received. He broached it cautiously by means of a homely simile. But both the sense of the two passages and the political circumstances under which they were written are so similar that there can be no doubt that the poet's own teaching when he speaks for himself in the parabasis of the Frogs is a

¹Cf. Thuc. iii. 82-84.

more precise and emphatic repetition of the doctrine which he promulgates earlier through the mouth of his character, Lysistrata. Threatening disaster appeared as imminent in 412 after the Sicilian catastrophe as before the battle of Arginusae in 406.¹ And there is no reason to suppose that post-victorious generosity in the Frogs would make Aristophanes any more lavish with the cherished franchise than post-calamitous apprehension in the Lysistrata.

As a rule, he maintains a conservative attitude in regard to the franchise; he shares the popular prejudices against upstarts of foreign extraction, and is habitually calling their citizenship in question. "Half-foreign" is a taunt of sycophants in the Acharnians.² In the Frogs, the demagogues, Archidemus and Cleophon, are reminded of certain weaknesses in their civic status; Archidemus has no clansmen;³ Cleophon has inherited a Thracian accent.⁴ Similar insinuations are more conspicuous in the Birds, where Execestides,⁵ Spintharus,⁶ and the tragic poet Acestor are branded as Carian, Phrygian, and Scythian respectively. "We are ill," says Euelpides, "of an illness the opposite of Sacas' [i.e., Scythian Acestor] for he, though no citizen, forces his way into citizenship."⁷ The poet's spleen against other persons named with disparagement is often explained, correctly or not, by the

¹Xen. Hell. i. 6. 24.

²Ach. 518.

³Ran. 421-22; cf. 588; Eupolis in scholium on Ran. 418. Archidemus receives a bad character from Lysias (xiv. 25) and is said by Xenophon (Hell. i. 7. 2) to have begun the agitation against the generals who commanded at Arginusae. Cf. Xen. Mem. ii. 9. 4 ff. for a more favorable view.

⁴Ran. 679 ff., 1504, 1533. Cf. Eur. Orestes 903 and other references cited in Holden, op. cit., s.v. "Cleophon."

⁵Av. 11, 764, 1527.

⁶Av. 762.

⁷Av. 31; Vesp. 1221; cf. Eupolis cited in Athenaeus vi. 237 a. Herodotus remarks (vii. 64) that "the Persians call all the Scythians, Sacae." Cf. Gilbert, Beiträge, p. 167. Other references are given in Kock's note on Av. 31.

scholiast on the same grounds.¹ Particularly striking is the ironical invitation to beget ancestors and acquire clansmen, issued by the chorus in the Birds after they have fallen under the spell of the demagogic wiles of Peisthetaerus. Though they countenance it, they admit that it is treachery to make concessions to the disfranchised.² Obviously, the question of citizenship must have been well to the fore at the time when the Birds was written. The one historical grant of citizenship mentioned in Aristophanes, the compliment paid to Sadocus, the son of the Thracian king, is scarcely a case in point.³ The probability of the Thracian prince ever exercising his civic rights at Athens was exceedingly remote, and the gift had no direct bearing upon an extension or restriction of the franchise. A conservative might, nevertheless, object to the misuse of a carefully guarded privilege as an honorary title.

On the other hand, it is important to notice that the poet's criticism is not one-sided. Censorious as he is in desiring the exclusion of the undeserving, he is no more favorable to xenelasia in Athens than in Sparta.⁴ Particularly, on the occasion of a public distribution of grain, clever sycophants found opportunities of impugning the citizenship of many a worthy and wordless Athenian of the older school who defended himself at a disadvantage against unscrupulous rhetoric.⁵

¹E.g., Diitrephes in scholium on Av. 798; Lycurgus in scholium on Av. 1296; Chaireas in scholium on Vesp. 687.

²Av. 765-66.

³Ach. 145 ff.; Thuc. ii. 29, 67.

⁴Vesp. 718. The scholiast states that a xenelasia occurred in Athens on the occasion of the dole of 445-444. Aristophanes criticized the Spartan practice in Av. 1013. The term, however, was not used with the same meaning in both cases. In Athens, the scholiast meant to indicate disfranchisement. In Sparta, the practice referred to was prohibition of residence.

⁵Ach. 676-91; Plut. Per. 37: "And many fell victims to the

But five poor bushels of barley each is all that you ever
obtained in fact,
And that doled out by the quart, while first they worry you
under the Alien Act. ¹

We cannot determine to what dole or to what series of prosecutions for non-citizenship Aristophanes refers, but it is probable that there were several in Athens during the war in view of the destitute condition of many rural citizens who had taken refuge within the city walls.² The only well authenticated instance of the period was that which followed the gift of Psammetichos in 444 when many persons were expelled from the list and some may have been sold into slavery.³

activities of sycophants." Cf. the sycophantic threat of a prosecution for non-citizenship made by the agents of the Thirty to Aristophanes of Cholleidæ (Lysias xiii. 60) which carried with it a threat of extreme punishment.

¹Vesp. 717-18, trans. Rogers.

²van Leeuwen and Rogers ad loc. Müller-Strübing (op. cit., pp. 92-96) believes that the Aristophanic reference is to the dole of 444, but admits that other similar doles occurred during the war. Fränkel admits that Böckh was wrong in supposing that the occasion for the dole referred to in the Wasps was an expedition against Euboea in the year preceding the production of the play (August Böckh, Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener, hrsg. von Max Fränkel [3d ed.; Berlin, 1886], I, 112-13, note 161).

³Philochorus (scholium on Vesp. 718) says that 4,760 were found improperly enrolled as citizens. Plutarch (Per. 37) says that little fewer than 5,000 were convicted and sold into slavery. But according to the law known to Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 42. 1) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (de Isaeo 16, p. 617) and Libanius (Argument to Demos. lvii), disfranchisement did not necessarily entail slavery. Disfranchisement might result from a diapsephisis or scrutiny held by the demesmen, in which case the disfranchised persons might remain in Athens as metics. Only if they appealed to the courts and lost, were they sold into slavery. Plutarch's statement could not be true unless every person that was disfranchised, appealed to the courts and lost. Unless he had unimpeachable proof of his citizenship, a man would scarcely appeal in the face of such a penalty. On the other hand, A. W. Gomme maintains that "not only was enslavement not a penalty for unsuccessful appeal, but that there was no penalty, except in the case where it was decided that the appellant was a slave" ("Two Problems of Athenian Citizenship Law," Class. Phil., XXIX [1934], p. 135). It is doubtful, however, whether the law in question existed in the fifth century. Aubrey Diller ("The Decree of Demophilus, 346-345 B.C.," Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc., LXIII [1932], pp. 193-205)

Personal experience may have entered into Aristophanes' attitude to this question if, as tradition asserts, his own civic rights had been thrice contested.¹ Himself, he proclaimed as a benefactor of the state.² In general, he regarded the franchise and its privileges rather as the reward for loyalty and service, than as the prize of unscrupulous ambition, or the subject of pettifogging technicality. He had already delivered himself in the Wasps of a very emphatic and striking assertion of this point of view, that "whoso wears no sting shall never carry off the obols three."³

ascribes its origin to Demophilus, 346-345 B.C., and holds (after Adolf Philipp, Beiträge zu einer Geschichte des attischen Bürgerrechts [Berlin, 1870], pp. 34 ff.) that the cases of disputed citizenship occurring in 445-444 were handled by the graphe xenias. The latter action involved a different procedure, and enslavement may have been the penalty for conviction (cf. Lipsius, op. cit., p. 416, and Gomme, op. cit., pp. 138-39). Lipsius (op. cit., p. 415, note 150) says that for such a large number of persons to have been convicted under the graphe xenias is simply impossible, and that a diapsephisis must have taken place. But it generally agreed that no reliance can be placed upon the number given by Philochorus, and we have no means of knowing how many persons were affected. Busolt (G.G., III, Part I, 502, note 3) put it at only a few hundred. Cf. Müller-Strübing, op. cit., pp. 87-88, 94; K. J. Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 75-81; G. B. Grundy, Thucydides and the History of His Age (London, 1911), p. 198; CAH, V, 102, 168.

¹He was thrice compelled to prove his citizenship according to the Greek life (Aristophanis comoediae, ed. G. Dindorf [Oxonii, 1838], IV, Part I, 34). Cf. Ach. 630; Vesp. 1284-91.

²Ach. 633, 641-58.

³Vesp. 1114-21; cf. supra, p. 10. The passage from the Wasps suggests a comparison with two features of the ideal constitution of the moderate party, realized under the government of the Five Thousand: first, that there should be no pay for any public duty other than military service; second, that the franchise should be limited to those who could equip themselves for military service (Thuc. viii. 65, 97; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 29, 33). But the comparison is misleading. The context in the Wasps suggests service in a democratic fleet rather than an aristocratic infantry. The "oar" and the "blister" (l. 1119) are credentials for the citizenship of the poorer classes. Furthermore, if Aristophanes had really been an advocate of any such limitation of the franchise, he would not be expected to abandon his principles on the eve of their realization, and urge that the metics and aliens be mingled with the citizens, as he does in the Lysistrata. Nor

This attitude is in accord with what we know of normal conditions governing a grant of Athenian citizenship. In the laws of Solon, citizenship had been given only to aliens, especially artisans, who became permanent residents.¹ The action of Cleisthenes in enrolling aliens and slaves as citizens in the tribes was exceptional and revolutionary, and may be regarded as a political maneuver.² It may also have given recognition and acknowledgment to residents of long standing and public spirit.³ In the latter

would he have taken occasion, as he does in the Birds (ll. 125-26) to make a joke of Aristocrates, who appears to have been the principal agent for the establishment of the Five Thousand (Aristotle Ath. Pol. 33; Lysias xii. 66; Thuc. viii. 89).

¹Plut. Solon 24: "One is astounded at his law of adopting foreigners into the state which permits no one to become a full citizen in Athens unless he be either exiled for life from his native city, or transfers himself with his whole family to Athens to practise his trade there. It is said that his object in this was not so much to exclude other classes of people from the city, as to assure these people of a safe refuge there; and these he thought would be good and faithful citizens, because the former had been banished from their own country, and the latter had abandoned it of their own freewill" (trans. Aubrey Stewart). The objects of this law are discussed by E. Szanto, Untersuchungen über das attische Bürgerrecht (Wien, 1881), pp. 26-27. He argues that the provision in regard to exiles was still valid in the time of Demosthenes, drawing the inference from Contra Aristocratem (p. 662): "Python here, as soon as he had slain Cotys, thinking it not safe to wander at random, came to you and demanded citizenship." Cf. Thuc. i. 2: "The most influential men of the other parts of Hellas, when they were driven out of their own countries by war or sedition, resorted to Athens as being a firmly settled community and, becoming citizens, from the very earliest times, made the city still greater in the number of its inhabitants." The scholiast adds that in later times the Athenians no longer gave citizenship so readily, because the number of citizens was already so large. Cf. CAH, V, 103.

²Cf. R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle (Chicago, 1930), I, 196: "Nothing that is known of Cleisthenes justifies the belief that he was a man with a mission. He was rather the type of politician that not only senses the political aspirations of the masses but has the wisdom to estimate their fitness for further exercise of power."

³Aristotle Ath. Pol. 20, 21; Politics iii. 2. (1275b. 37). Michel Clerc, Les métèques athéniens (Paris, 1893), p. 329, says: "Si Clisthène put les admettre dans ses tribus, c'est précisément parce que ces hommes étaient fixés depuis longtemps déjà sur le sol de l'Attique et avaient donné à la cité des preuves de leur attachement, etc." Diodorus (xi. 43) says that Themistocles per-

half of the fifth century, desirable immigrants became more and more necessary to maintain the navy and the industries.¹ But, Pericles, though he encouraged immigration,² apparently stood for restriction of the franchise.³ As the value of the citizenship increased, its possessors became less willing to share their privileges, and perquisites.⁴ However, with the loss of life entailed by the war, a more liberal policy again developed.⁵ Isocrates

sued the people "to make the metics and artisans exempt from taxation in order that a great host might settle in the city and easily establish many industries." Cf. CAH, V, 102.

¹Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. 1. 12 (trans. Petch): "This then is why we placed even slaves on a footing of equality with free men; and we placed aliens on a footing of equality with citizens, because the state has need of aliens owing to the number of skilled trades and because of the fleet." Cf. Thuc. 1. 121, 143; vii. 13. At the invasion of Megaris in 431, the metics furnished three thousand hoplites for the Athenian army (Thuc. ii. 31). Cf. Xen. Poroi ii, iii. 5.

²Pericles induced the Syracusan Cephalus, the father of Lysias, to settle in Athens as a metic (Lysias xii.4; Dion. Hal. Lysias i; Ps.-Plut. X Oratorum vitae 835 C). Cf. Thuc. ii. 39: "We throw our city open to all the world."

³In 451-450. Pericles proposed a law by which only the children of parents who were both Athenian citizens could inherit the citizenship. Vide, Plut. Per. 37. Aristotle Ath. Pol. 26 says that the law was passed because of the surplus of citizens. Lipsius (op. cit., p. 412) accepts this statement, but Busolt (G.G., III, Part I, 338, n. 3) has shown that this mistakes the motive. Cf. Aelian Var. hist. vi.10 and xiii. 24; Suidas s.v. "Demopoietos." Cf. Sandys' note on Aristotle Ath. Pol. 26: "It had been argued that no such law could have been proposed by Pericles . . . that the 'law of Pericles' was really a revision of the list of citizens in 444." The Aristotelian statement settled the question. Cf. CAH, V, 86, 102-3.

⁴Beloch (Bevölkerung, p. 80) shows in answer to Fränkel that the narrowing of the circle of citizenship was a popular democratic measure, as one might expect, inasmuch as it was sponsored by the democratic leader, Pericles. Cf. Lipsius, op. cit., p. 413, n. 141; Meyer, op. cit., IV², 14; CAH, V, 102-3.

⁵Gustav Gilbert, The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, trans. E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin (London, 1895), p. 187: "The Periclean law had become obsolete in consequence of the great losses which had thinned the ranks of the burgess body in the course of the Peloponnesian War." Cf. to the same effect, A. H. J. Greenidge, Greek Constitutional History (London, 1896), p. 132; Wilamowitz, "Demotica der attischen Metöken," Hermes, XXII (1887), 245; Lipsius, op. cit., pp. 414, 474, 507; L. Beauchet,

says that "at last, without knowing what they did, they filled the public tombs with citizens, and the clans and deme registers with those who were bound by no ties to the city."¹ The cause of this unwonted laxity was the need of men to take the places of the slain. Andocides reminds the Athenians that they have made citizens of Thessalians and Andrians because of the "lack of men."² But, even in the greatest of crises, citizenship was not given at random nor without cause. It was either the reward or the inducement for public service, usually of a military nature.³ And so, in 410,⁴ Andocides admits that the grant of citizenship to slaves and foreigners of all kinds is justified when they have conferred some benefit upon the state. From the same year, 410-409, we have our oldest extant inscription of the conferring of citizenship upon an individual, Thrasybulus the Calydonian, presumably for the assassination of Phrynichus.⁵ The words of the decree point to andragathia as the cause. From the latter two references, Szanto concludes⁶ that there was already in effect some such law

Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne (Paris, 1897), I, 186.

¹Isoc. viii. 88.

²Andoc. i. 149, delivered 399 (Jebb and Blass).

³Szanto, Untersuchungen, pp. 28-30, from a study of the evidence, assigns three motives for the grant of citizenship: exile, skill in a craft, service to the state. He suggests that andragathia as well as "lack of men" may have been responsible for the grants mentioned by Andocides i. 149.

⁴Andoc. ii. 23, delivered 410 (Jebb), 409 (Blass, Att. Bered., I², 290, 298).

⁵Corpus inscriptionum Atticarum (Berolini, 1873), I, 59. Cf. Gilbert, Const. Antiq., p. 185, n. 1; Szanto, Untersuchungen, pp. 14, 30; Lysias xiii. 71-72 and Lycurgus Contra Leocratem 112 who are authorities for connecting Thrasybulus with the assassination of Phrynichus. Neither Thucydides (viii. 92) nor Plutarch (Alc. 25) mention Thrasybulus. Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1503, n. 5.

⁶Untersuchungen, p. 30.

as that cited in the speech against Neaera: "For there is a law enacted by the people that it is forbidden to make an Athenian of one who is not worthy to become a citizen on account of andragathia to the Athenian Demos."¹ Speaking of the same period of the critical days of the Deceleian War, Diodorus adds: "Suffering constant losses, the Athenians made citizens of the metics, and those of the aliens as well that were willing to fight with them."² In the same spirit, too, on the fall of the Thirty, Thrasybulus of Steira proposed a decree for the gift of citizenship to all who had taken part in the return of the people from Peiraeus, though some of them were slaves.³ Thrasybulus' decree was successfully challenged by Archinus, who, however, compromised by carrying a grant of citizenship to the little group of foreigners who had stood with the first small band of exiles at Phyle.⁴ About the same time, Aristophon moved the re-enactment of Pericles' restriction law, but Nicomenes secured a modification conceding full citizenship to those who had enjoyed it up to that time, if only one parent of each had been a citizen.⁵ This was one of those excellent bits of legislation which gave constitutional recognition to a situation which had naturally resulted from the stark realities of the war. Pericles himself had lived to beg dispensation from his own law, and, on the death of his two legi-

¹Ps.-Demos. lix. 89.

²xiii. 97.

³Aristotle Ath. Pol. 40. 2 and Sandys' note ad loc.

⁴E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill, A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford, 1901), No. 80. Cf. Aeschines iii. 187, 190, 195.

⁵Athenaeus xiii. 577b; Müller, FHG, IV, 358; scholiast on Aeschines i. 39; Demos. lvii. 30. Cf. Arnold Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit (2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1885), I, 138-39; Gilbert, Const. Antig., p. 187; Lipsius, op. cit., pp. 414, n. 146, and 474; G. F. Schömann, Griechische Altertümer (4th ed., bearb. von J. H. Lipsius; Berlin, 1897-1902), I, 377; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1546.

timate sons, to ask citizenship for the junior Pericles, son of Aspasia and technically a nothos.¹ Since his law of 451, residents of Athens, both of whose parents were not citizens, must have been legally either metics² or xenoi with reference to the franchise, but, as casualties increased, so did contemporary disregard for such technical distinctions, and the nothoi must generally have shared the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.³

The exigencies and temper of the time tended to break down the narrow hereditary limitations of the franchise, and to replace them with the more vital requirements of practical political harmony and co-operation, nor did the conservatism of Aristophanes prevent him from supporting a radical policy that was obviously in agreement with his own political and Panhellenic sympathies. We may assume that the greater number of aliens resident in Athens were Greeks, hailing largely, perhaps, from the Athenian Empire. Even the barbarians of miscellaneous origin, included among the metics by Xenophon in the middle of the next century, are shown by him to have fought as hoplites with the Athenians, in addition to being otherwise valuable members of the populace.⁴ It is worth noting that both Xenophon and Aristophanes

¹Suidas s.v. "Demopoiotos"; Aelian Var. Hist. vi. 10 and xlii. 24; Plut. Per. 37; Beauchet, op. cit., I, 532-34.

²Beauchet (op. cit., I, 202), and K. F. Hermann (Lehrbuch der griechischen Rechtsaltertümer [3d ed., hrsg. von Th. Thalheim; Freiburg, 1884], p. 8, n. 3) say that they formed a class intermediate between citizens and metics. This is supported by the Argument to Demos. lvii. In favor of xenoi, vide Demos. lvii. 24 and Suidas s.v. "Demopoiotos."

³Lipsius, op. cit., pp. 414, 474, 507.

⁴Xen. Poroi ii. 3: "But as a matter of fact even the city would be benefited if the citizens should take the field by themselves rather than if, as now, Lydians and Phrygians and Syrians and other barbarians from every land should take the field with them; for there are many such among the metics." They are referred

owe the spirit of generosity in which they would reform the civic relations of metics to the same political circumstances, Athenian embarrassment in foreign relations.¹ Embarrassment abroad was an added incentive to promote domestic unity by the removal of artificial inequalities from an otherwise homogeneous society. Such metics as owed their disfranchisement to descent from one foreign parent should be the first to benefit from any suggested extension of the citizenship. Their number would be augmented from time to time by the arrival in Athens of sons of Athenian cleruchs who had married native wives.² No class could be more suitable from which to recruit the ranks of full citizens. They were half Athenian in blood and wholly so in sentiment. Their claims would meet with the favor and support of Aristophanes who would see in their enfranchisement a return to the conditions which prevailed before Pericles passed his demagogic decree of 451.³ In those brighter days, Themistocles and Cimon, whom Aristophanes delighted

to as "hoplites" in Poroi ii. 2. Cf. Thuc. ii. 31. It is possible that Xenophon does not here confine himself to the strictly technical sense of "metic" but includes the xenoi also. That seems to be the case at least in Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. i. 12 (vide Kalinka's note). We know that the Athenian force sent to Delium in 424 (the date of the Ath. Pol.) included xenoi (Thuc. iv. 90) though they were not hoplites. Between 424 and 355 (the date of the Poroi; vide Clerc, op. cit., p. 311 and Schaefer, op. cit., I, 193) the use of mercenaries increased (Isoc. vii. 9) as did also the reluctance of Athenian citizens to serve in the army (cf. Clerc, op. cit., pp. 313-14). The number of xenoi and metics of barbarian origin in proportion to those of Hellenic extraction was probably greater in Athens in 355 than in 424 or 411.

¹Clerc, op. cit., p. 311; Xen. Poroi vi. 1.

²H. Swoboda ("Zur Geschichte der attischen Kleruchien," Serta Harteliana [Wien, 1896], p. 32, and again in G. Busolt, Griechische Staatskunde: Zweite Hälfte, bearb. von Heinrich Swoboda [München, 1926], p. 1272) holds that in 412 and 411 there could not be any considerable number of cleruchs left either in Chalcis or Lesbos, and that they had probably been recalled to Athens for the needs of defence. Lesbos, however, was recaptured by the Athenians almost immediately after its revolt, and Oreos remained an Athenian cleruchy (Thuc. viii. 23, 95). Cf. Antiphon Frag. 7 (Thalheim) for return of cleruch to Athens.

³Lipsius, op. cit., p. 507.

to idealize, and many other distinguished sons of foreign mothers, had held full civic rights to the great comfort and profit of Athens and the Panhellenic cause.¹

In a much discussed passage of the Acharnians, we have the almost certain proof that Aristophanes recognized the metics as part and parcel of the community, united in sympathy and loyalty to the body politic. Describing his audience at the Lenaea, he says: "We are by ourselves, clean-winnowed, for I call the metics the bran of the citizens." Astoi and metoikoi together form the the "whole wheat" of the burges body.² Thucydides seems to have accepted this view of the complementary relations of citizens and metics so far as to include both under the one name of "astoi." Describing the military strength of Athens before the battle of Delium, he states first, that Hippocrates "marshalled the Athenians en masse, themselves and the metics and as many xenoi as were present."³ Repeating himself a little farther on, he says: "There had been a levy en masse of xenoi that were present and of astoi."⁴ Treating the whole expressions as equivalent, and subtracting "xenoi" from both sides of the equation, we find that "themselves and the metics" equals "astoi."⁵ If citizens and metics could be considered a unit for non-technical purposes,⁶ it was but a short

¹Beauchet, op. cit., I, 190-99; CAH, V, 49. Cf. Plut. Per. 29 for Cimon's son by an Arcadian mother.

²Ach. 507-8. This is the interpretation of Müller-Strübing (op. cit., pp. 612-15), Rogers, Van Leeuwen, Starkie, Rennie, and Merry. Merry adds: "This interpretation is rather at the expense of the true meaning of χρῆμα which is regularly taken to mean 'chaff.'"

³Thuc. iv. 90.

⁴Thuc. iv. 94.

⁴Wilamowitz, Hermes, XXII (1887), 225.

⁵Cf. Thuc. vi. 27, 30; Clerc, op. cit., p. 297: "Sans être citoyens, ils faisaient partie intégrante de la cité." Wilamowitz calls the metics "quasi-citizens" (Hermes, XXII [1887], 246, 248, 249) which Lipsius denies (op. cit., p. 371, n.8).

step further for Aristophanes to propose the removal of the anomaly and the full recognition of the metics as politai. It is a striking and convincing indication of the consistency and continuity of his political views, that, in 425, he coined a definition of the metics which justifies his advice of 411, that they be granted full citizenship.

In addition to metics, Lysistrata would make citizens of "any stranger or friend of yours." This may seem surprising, because, as has been pointed out, Aristophanes sometimes separates the metoikoi from the xenoi,¹ but a closer examination will show that there is no rigid distinction between the two. "Xenos" is a term of wider application, and may include "metoikos."² It is probable that in the Knights where they are not distinguished, "xenos metoikos" is the original definitive designation which was later shortened to "metoikos"; and any emendations of the line were beside the mark.³ Aristophanes of Byzantium makes it clear that a xenos temporarily resident in Athens was called "parepidanos," but that if he made Athens his permanent residence, and was assessed for certain taxes, he became a metic.⁴ Harpocration⁵ gives

¹Ach. 504-5; Pax 297 and Sharples's note. Cf. Neil's note on Eq. 347.

²Clerc (op. cit., p. 327, n. 2) quotes Demos. xx. 21, 29; xxii. 21; Lycurgus Leoc. 41.

³Eq. 347, emended by Müller-Strübing (op. cit., p. 611) and by Van Leeuwen. Sophocles (Oed. Tyr. 452) and Euripides (Supp. 892) support my conclusion. The expression in Aristophanes is no more technical than those in Sophocles and Euripides. All three passages show that the two terms overlap, and that the Greeks refused to be bound by a verbal distinction which did not represent a rigid difference in fact. The ranks of the metics were continually recruited from the xenoi.

⁴Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta, ed. Augustus Nauck (Halis, 1848), No. 38, pp. 193-94, and notes. Cf. Lipsius, op. cit., p. 370, n. 6; p. 371, n. 8.

⁵S.v. "metoikion," p. 203. Cf. also scholiast on Plato Laws viii, quoted in Blaydes' note on Eq. 347.

practically the same information. On the other hand, in the political parlance of the Athenian Empire, "xenos," more commonly in the plural, was often technical for a citizen of one of the allied cities.¹ It is in this sense that Aristophanes does distinguish between xenoi and metoikoi in the passage from the Acharnians cited above. The citizens and metics are by themselves because the xenoi from the allied cities have not yet reached Athens with the tribute. Where, however, both metics and allies have their own separate designations in that enthusiastic and comprehensive summons of Trygaeus in the Peace:

O all ye farmers, merchants, artisans,
O all ye craftsmen, aliens, sojourners,
O all ye islanders, O all ye peoples!²

the xenoi, well designated "sojourners" by Rogers, are precisely the parepidemoi of Aristophanes of Byzantium. They may have been allies or islanders before, and may become metics later, and at the moment are neither. This passage furnishes the clue to the meaning of "xenos" as used by Lysistrata. She has already mentioned the metics, and she subsequently refers to the allies and islanders as "poleis" and "apoikoi." By "xenos" she means a member of that large floating population, more or less transient, which was always present in an important metropolis like Athens.³ Many of them would be sailors attracted by the mercenary service in the Athenian fleet. Even so, they would be largely Greek, drawn from the states of the confederacy, as we learn from the Thucydidean Pericles. Pericles argues that the Athenian mer-

¹Ach. 503, 505; Eq. 326, 1197, 1408; Pax 297, 644; Av. 1431, 1454, 1458; Lys. 1058; Ran. 458; Frag. 543 (Hall and Geldart).

²Pax 296-98, trans. Rogers. Van Leeuwen: "tum peregrinos in Attica habitantes [metics] vel nunc certe--Liberalibus--illic versantes [xenous] dein qui peregre sunt socios civitatis Atheniensium."

³Thuc. iv. 94. 1, 101. 2; vi. 30.

cenaries or xenoi will not desert for higher pay, because desertion from Athenian service would mean exile from their homes in the Athenian Empire.¹ Thus, we see the Panhellenic bearing of the passage. Aristophanes has no intention of suggesting any wholesale enfranchisement of unattached migrants. It is important to notice that the term "xenos" is qualified by the following words, "or friend of yours." The Greek conjunction is used epexegetically.² Not every xenos, but only such as were friends of the Athenian people are embraced in the poet's solicitude. His conservatism asserts itself in the same wise safeguard, the same reservation as we find applied when citizenship was given to the fugitive Plataeans:

Now see, gentlemen, how fair and just were the terms of the decree which the orator moved on behalf of the Athenian people. He thought it right that those Plataeans that accepted the gift should first be proved in the dicastic court, man by man, as to whether he was a Plataean, and whether he was one of the friends of the city, in order that on this pretext, many might not receive a share in the citizenship.³

¹Thuc. i. 143.

²R. Kühner (Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: Zweiter Teil besorgt Bernhard Gerth [3d ed.; Hannover und Leipzig, 1898-1904], II, 297, sec. 538) recognizes the epexegetic use "wenn an die Stelle eines Ausdrukes ein anderer zur Erklärung gesetzt wird" and cites Plato Phaedo 85 D. W. D. Geddes (The Phaedo of Plato [2nd ed.; London, 1885], p. 281, note P) cites the following passages where the conjunction is "clearly epexegetic": Aeschylus Persae 354, 424; Sophocles Philoctetes 946. Those editors who do not agree with Kühner-Gerth and Geddes are compelled to bracket or delete the conjunction. R. D. Archer-Hind (The Phaedo of Plato [London, 1883], ad loc.) says: "That η is ever explanatory I do not believe; it certainly is not so in the passages cited by Prof. Geddes." Léon Robin (Platon: Phédon [Budé edition; Paris, 1926]) translates the conjunction, "Je veux dire." H. W. Smyth (A Greek Grammar for Colleges [New York, 1926], sec. 2856) says: " η with the subjunctive is often used when a speaker corrects himself, as in Aeschylus Choephoroi 1074." Cf. discussion of η in Andoc. i. 78 by Gertrude Smith in Class. Phil., XVI (1921), 348. Wilamowitz interprets the line from the Lysistrata as I have done, but in order to obtain the interpretation, he emends $\kappa\epsilon\iota$ to $\kappa\alpha\iota$ and η to η (Aristophanes Lysistrata [1927], ad loc.).

³Ps.-Demos. lix. 105.

Lysistrata, too, makes the prospective citizen's enfranchisement conditional upon his friendship or andragathia to the state. How the qualification was to be proven, is a practical detail that is not specified in her statement of general principles, but the precedent of the Plataeans suggests dokimasia as the natural method. It is pertinent to recall that the phrase "xenos kai philos" is used of Cephalus,¹ the father of that Lysias whose services to the democracy Thrasybulus would have rewarded with the franchise.² Not the first but the second member of the formula, the friendship or attachment of Cephalus to Pericles, accounts for his removal from Syracuse to Athens.³ Likewise, the attachment of his son to the democracy, almost won him the citizenship. So too, Aristophanes, still consistent with his unchanging patriotism, subjoins the words "or friend of yours" to indicate the justification for his rather sweeping proposal. In the present context, quite apart from any grammatical question as to the force of the conjunction, the word "friend" can have no other use, nor is there any class of persons not already counted as metics or xenoi to whom it could refer.⁴ "Lack of men" was the motive for

¹Ps.-Plut. X Oratorum vitae 835 C. It would be interesting to be able to account for the MS reading of Lysias xix. 19 where Lysias himself was described as "philos kai xenos." Cf. Jebb, op. cit., I, 151. The combination is not uncommon, e.g., Xen. Anab. ii. 1. 5.

²Scholliast on Aeschines iii. 195; C. Walz, Rhetores Graeci (Stuttgart, 1832-1836), V, 343; Ps.-Plut. X Oratorum vitae 835 E-F.

³Lysias xii. 4; Dion. Hal. Lysias 1.

⁴Van Leeuwen identifies the two terms here: "idem homines utroque vocabulo nunc designantur: quisquis inter peregrinos vobis amicus est." Wilamowitz comments: "dazu auch einzelne Fremde, aber die nur, wenn sie auch φίλοι sind; nur so ergibt sich Sinn." Meyer(op. cit., IV², 12) translates: "jeden Fremden, der Euch Freund ist." Rogers (note ad loc.) seems to be slightly in error in saying: "The accusative τοὺς in line 581 comprehends the three classes introduced by the words κεί τῃς." There are not three classes introduced by κεί τῃς, but two only, the friendly aliens and the disfranchised.

the suggested extension of the citizen roll at this time, but both the conservatism and the common sense of Aristophanes taught him that the proposal would defeat its own purpose if it did not insist upon public service and loyalty as the indispensable condition of the gift.¹

Lysistrata's allegory, as we have said, has two applications, one to local politics, and the other to the relations between Athens and the allied cities of her empire. The single purpose of the twofold scheme is to produce a cloak of common goodwill. In local politics, the condition is to be brought about, first, by the removal of those agents and organizations which have been the nuclei of faction whether democratic or oligarchic, and second, by giving de jure status to the de facto unity of the loyal city populace, that is, by putting metics and friendly aliens and public debtors on a perfect equality with full citizens.² But even in its local application, as we have just shown, the criticism of Aristophanes is controlled and directed by his conception of the effect of domestic policies upon the mutual interests of Athens and her allies.

¹Clerc, op. cit., p. 316; Böckh-Fränkel, op. cit., I, 702.

²Rogers (note, l. 574) is scarcely just in saying that the "peace, unity, and concord" of the Aristophanic ideal was "partially achieved for a brief period in the course of this very year." Adolf Holm is more nearly correct in his criticism of the constitution of the Five Thousand: "Thucydides declares this to have been the best constitution which Athens enjoyed in his time. Theoretically that might have been the case, although this is open to grave doubt; but in practice it was not a success, and it only lasted so long as the 'sailor-rabble' was occupied elsewhere" (The History of Greece from its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation, Eng. trans. revised F. Clarke [London, 1896], II, 497). Aristophanes, with his proposals for the extension of the citizenship, certainly did not have in mind any limited timocracy.

C. Imperial Reform

The second application of the allegory is concerned with groups that Lysistrata defines in three ways: first, as "the cities"; second, as "the colonies of this land"; and third, as "our wool-flocks, as it were, lying separate and apart." The first condition of intelligent reform, she asserts, is an appreciation of the significance of this definition, or rather its third component part. The term "polis" or "city" indicates a self-sufficient political unit and, therefore, does not refer to those cleruchs who, whether as separate farmers,¹ or as concentrated garrisons,² lived in the territory of another state and yet remained citizens of Athens.³ On the contrary, in Aristophanes, "the cities," with or without qualification, frequently becomes a variant or synonymous expression for "xenoi" to designate the confederate allies.⁴

In the second place, to speak of "all" the cities "that are colonies of this land" may seem surprising when we remember that, exclusive of cleruchies, that special Athenian type of

¹E.g., Euthyphro at Naxos (Plato Euthyphro 4 C). Cf. Gilbert, Const. Antiq., p. 447.

²E.g., the fort at Eretria (Thuc. viii. 95). Cf. Meyer, op. cit., IV², 3, sec. 395 and references; Gilbert, loc. cit.

³Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, II, 1276; Gilbert, Const. Antiq. p. 450 and note.

⁴According to H. Dunbar (A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes [Oxford, 1883]) the plural "cities" occurs twenty-six times in Aristophanes. Of these, at least eleven refer to the allied cities of the empire: Ach. 506, 642-3; Eq. 802; Vesp. 657, 670, 700, 707; Pax 619; Av. 1425; Lys. 582; and perhaps several others include them, as: Ach. 192; Pax, 63, 231, 266, 421, 539. But it is absurd to maintain that "the cities" in Aristophanes can refer only to members of the empire; e.g., in Pax 63, 231, 266, and perhaps 539, "the cities" must include the city mentioned in Pax 251, which is in Sicily and not part of the empire. Vesp. 925 likewise refers to Sicilian cities.

colony, Athens in historical times sent out very few colonies. We know of Brea,¹ Thurii,² and Amphipolis³ which might conform to the scholiasts' limitation of settlements in an uninhabited region.⁴ We know also that, after expelling their inhabitants, Athens settled Hestiaea,⁵ Aegina,⁶ Potidaea,⁷ Scione,⁸ and Melos⁹ with her own colonists whom Thucydides calls in some cases "apoikoi" and in others "epoikoi." To this list perhaps Scyros¹⁰ should be added, and still the total would be inconsiderable. But we find a more suggestive use of "apoikoi" in Thucydides. In the muster of contingents for the Sicilian Expedition, he groups the Lemnians and Imbrians with the Aeginetans and the Hestiaeans as "apoikoi" who still used the same dialect and institutions as the

¹Inscriptiones Graecae², I, 45; Hicks and Hill, op. cit., No. 41. Colony settled in 446, Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 417.

²Diodorus xii. 10 ff., 35; Dion. Hal. Lysias 1; Suidas s.v. "Thuriomanteis" and "Lampon"; scholiast on Nub. 332; Av. 521. Colony settled in 443, Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 530 ff., 537.

³Thuc. i. 100; iv. 102; v. 11. Colony settled in 436, Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 558.

⁴Scholiast on Thuc. ii. 27.

⁵Thuc. i. 114; vii. 57 called "apoikoi." Settled by Athens 446, Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 429-30.

⁶Thuc. ii. 27; viii. 69 called "epoikoi." Thuc. vii. 57 called "apoikoi." Settled in 431, Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 936.

⁷Thuc. ii. 70 called "epoikoi." Also in CIA, I, 340. Settled in 430, Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 961.

⁸Thuc. v. 32; Diodorus xii. 76; Isoc. iv. 109. Settled by Plataeans in 421, Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1211.

⁹Thuc. v. 116 called "apoikoi." Settled in 416, Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1271.

¹⁰Thuc. i. 98; Plut. Cimon 8; Nepos Cimon 5; Paus. i. 17. 6; Diodorus xi. 60; Andoc. iii. 12. Busolt-Swoboda (Staatskunde, II, 1272-73) puts the occupation of Scyros in 473, but says that Plutarch is incorrect in saying that the whole population was expelled. He quotes IG, XII, 8, 668 to show that the Athenian colonists were cleruchs.

Athenians who were themselves Ionians.¹ The group which immediately follows, and whose affinity with Athens is somewhat less pronounced, includes Eretrians, Chalcidians, Styrians, Ceans, Andrians, Tenians, Milesians, Samians, and Chians who are described as "almost all of Athenian extraction and Ionians." The scholiast explains the phrase "of Athenian extraction" as "obviously apoikoi,"² and his interpretation is adequately supported by other passages in Thucydides where "of Athenian extraction" is an alternative description of Ionians whom he has already called "Athenian colonies."³ In fact, we find the careful Thucydides substantiating the claim of Athens to be the metropolis of the Ionians of the islands and of the coast of Asia Minor, a claim

¹Thuc. vii. 57. R. Dahms (De Atheniensium sociorum
tributis quaestiones septem [Berlin, 1904], p. 17) argues that
the description "apoikoi" belongs only to the Hestiaeans because
of the force of the $\tau\eta$ immediately preceding (= praeterea), and
because the Aeginetans are twice called "epoikoi" by Thucydides.
But Busolt-Swoboda (Staatskunde, II, 1274, n.1) shows that "apoikoi"
is the general term for colonies of all kinds (cf. Gilbert, Const.
Antiq., p. 449, n. 2) and includes epoikoi. He takes the word
"apoikoi" here to include cleruchs, since that is what the Lemnians
and Imbrians, mentioned here, were, he says. But would it not be
more probable that the Lemnians and Imbrians meant in this passage
might also include tribute-paying native Ionians, who, he admits,
were still resident in the islands? Cf. Andoc. iii. 12.

2^o Of Athenian extraction" is my translation of the Thucydidean ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων upon which the comment of the scholiast is ἀποικιοὶ δὴλονότι. (Scholia in Thucydidem ad optimos codices collata, ed. Carolus Hude [Lipsiae, 1927], p. 394).

³Thuc. ii. 15: "the Ionians of Athenian extraction." The scholiast explains: "the apoikoi of the Athenians." Thuc. vi. 76: "for becoming leaders of the Ionians, who were willing, and all the allies that were derived from themselves." The scholiast again explains: "all that were their apoikoi." Thuc. i. 2: "and later on as Attica was not sufficient, they sent out apoikoi into Ionia." Thuc. i. 12: "Hellas began to send out apoikiai and the Athenians colonized Ionia and most of the islands." Cf. Herod. viii. 46: "the Ceans being an Ionian race derived from Athens." Cf. Thuc. v. 96 where Athenian subjects are described by the Melians as "your apoikoi in most cases." The Ionians in Sicily appealed to Athens for help on the ground of her relationship and this was the pretext on which the expedition under Laches was sent (Thuc. iii. 86; cf. iv. 61; vi. 6).

which culminates in the rhetorical Panhellenism of Isocrates.¹ Of the extent of the Athenian hegemony at the conclusion of the Peace of Nicias, Andocides says: "And we held the Chersonese, and Naxos, and two-thirds of Euboea; and it would be a long story to enumerate the other colonies one by one."² Here, "apoikiai," his word for colonies, must comprise all the other cities which acknowledged the leadership of Athens, irrespective of the technical limitations of the term. The contemporary usage of Thucydides and Andocides removes our difficulty about Aristophanes' meaning.³ By "colonies of this land," he means all cities that are members of the Athenian alliance, and among them the Ionians would undoubtedly predominate. That the Eye of the Great King in the Acharnians⁴ should address an Athenian ambassador as "Ionian" is Aristophanes' way of identifying Athenian metropolis and Ionian colonies as a homogeneous group in contrast to the Persian barbarian. So, again, as they rub elbows in the theatre,⁵ Ionian colonist and Athenian townsman jest together at the expense of Cleon by whose death their natural amity has been restored. To subscribe to the doctrine of the Athenian origin of the Ionians was but to reaffirm his allegiance to the Panhellenic tradition descended from Themistocles and Cimon,⁶ and once more to record

¹Isoc. xii. 42-43: "Now our ancestors . . . first took the islands of the Cyclades . . . and refrained from appropriating the lands of these islands for themselves, but instead settled upon them those of the Hellenes who were most lacking in means of subsistence. And after this, they founded many great cities on both continents" (trans. Norlin).

²Andoc. iii. 9, delivered 392 (Blass, Att. Bered., I, 298).

³Perhaps "apoikia" may have the same connotation in a fragment of the Cities of Eupolis (Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta, ed. Theodorus Kock, I, 314, No. 206).

⁴Ach. 104, 106.

⁵Pax 43-48.

⁶Themistocles is said (Herod. viii. 22) to have had engraved on the rocks at springs where Xerxes' troops would stop

his approval of the Delian League which was born of a common resolve to vindicate Ionian freedom under Athenian leadership.¹

In the third place, by way of emphasizing the implication of the words she has already used, Lysistrata says one must clearly discern that these city-colonies are "our wool-flocks, as it were, lying separate and apart." There are, probably two reasons for drawing attention to the individuality and separation of the cities. One is a desire to counteract the centrifugal force which was growing from dissatisfaction into revolt in Euboea, Lesbos, Chios, and elsewhere at this time.² The other is a clear appreciation of the Greek instinct for self-determination. Aristophanes deplored the disintegration of the League which was taking place before his eyes, and, at the same time, he felt that the cause of it was imperial restriction on local autonomy. The third part of Lysistrata's definition is, therefore, a statement of the essential principle of a successful confederacy, co-operation without loss

for water: "Men of Ionia, you are acting unjustly in taking the field against your fathers and attempting to enslave Greece. But by all means join our side, and if it is not possible for you to do so, do you even now at any rate assume a neutral position, both yourselves, and beg the Carians to do the same as you. But if neither of these courses is possible, and you have been bound fast by a necessity so great that you cannot stand aloof, in the action at least, when we join battle, do you deliberately play the coward, remembering that you have sprung from us, and that in the first instance the enmity between us and the barbarians arose on your account." Cf. Herod. vii. 51 where Artabanus speaks of Athens as the metropolis of the Ionians.

Plutarch lays considerable stress on the Panhellenism of Cimon in his life of the latter (chaps. 6, 16, 18). In chap. 18, he says: "In order, therefore, to prevent their quarreling with any other Greek state, or cruising with a large fleet among the islands and the Peloponnesian coast, and so becoming entangled in some petty war, he manned a fleet of two hundred triremes with the intention of sailing a second time to Cyprus, wishing both to train the Athenians to fight against the barbarians, and also to gain legitimate advantages for Athens by the plunder of her natural enemies" (trans. Aubrey Stewart).

¹Thuc. i. 96; iii. 10; vi. 76. Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 72.

²Thuc. viii. 5.

of identity. The colonies are flocks of the Athenian fleece because both are Ionian. Yet wool from different parts of the same fleece may differ in texture. In creating his figure, Aristophanes could scarcely have forgotten the wool of Miletus, famous for its quality. In the play, one of Lysistrata's women would desert the conspiracy to save her Milesian fleece from the moths.¹ It was precisely at Miletus, by the treaty of that name, that the Persian moths had wrought most serious damage to the Athenian fabric.² The damage had been made possible by the chafing of the cities at their loss of autonomy, and Sparta's professed intention of restoring it to them.³ Therefore, in his diagnosis--for that is the word in the text--of the only conditions upon which the colonial structure can continue, Aristophanes points to the equilibrium of two fundamentals, Athenian hegemony and allied autonomy.

Following the definition which has served to clarify the issue, comes the proposition upon which depends the whole virtue of Lysistrata's reform. If this allegorical enigma conceals any political suggestion, it can only be extracted after a careful weighing of words.

As Wilamowitz has observed,⁴ the detailed comparison between the textile processes and the corresponding political reform is carried through point for point from the newly shorn wool to the completed garment. He has observed, also, that we have now

¹Lys. 729-30.

²Lys. 108; Thuc. viii. 17, 29, 57-58. The revolt of Miletus, summer 412 (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1426), was followed by the first treaty. The third treaty was struck in February 411 (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1451).

³Thuc. viii. 43; cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1414.

⁴Note on Lys. 574-86.

reached the stage in the preparation of the wool and in the elaboration of the simile, where the capital and the colonies are not only homogeneous as Ionians, but both alike carded and ready for the spinning. The Athenians have been carded into the wool-basket, and the allies are described as katagmata or "carded flocks" scattered outside the basket but prepared for the distaff. Although the term "katagma"¹ is commonly used as a synonym for "tolupe," in the present instance it does not mean "clew" but represents the stage immediately preceding. This interpretation is in complete harmony with the connotation of the word in the other two well-known examples in Sophocles² and Plato³ where it signifies an "unspun flock," not yet made into thread. In the operation described by Lysistrata, the loose flocks are to be taken and made into a clew to be placed upon the distaff preparatory to spinning and weaving, two steps which she takes as one. The final product is to be a cloak, whose composition and pattern we must endeavor to discover.

It has been held by eminent scholars that the cloak was to be an Einheitsstaat created by the grant of Athenian citizenship to the inhabitants of the islands and Ionia, in effect an extension of the privileges of cleruchs to the other allies as well.⁴ There

¹Cf. Eustathius, p. 1414 ad Hom. Od. i. 242.

²Trachiniae 695. Cf. Jebb's note ad loc.: "Katagma properly meant the ball of wool on the distaff, from which the thread is drawn down (katagetai-deducitur) by the spinner. Here it is merely a synonym for mallos (690)." Jebb translates: "shred of wool." He adds the misleading note: "In Aristophanes Lys. 583 ff. katagma is the thread itself." Obviously, the word is used in the same sense in the Lysistrata as it is in the Trachiniae.

³Plato (Politicus 282 E) defines katagma as a "piece of carded wool which is drawn out lengthwise and breadthwise" (Jowett), later to be made into a firm thread.

⁴This is the view of Beloch, Attische Politik, pp. 67-68; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1414; Meyer, op. cit., IV, 12, and 559 (quoted and adopted by Van Leeuwen, note on Lys. 574); and

are several considerations that render this interpretation unacceptable. We must remember that we are discussing a proposal of Aristophanes, and that it is unlikely that he would propose a scheme which involved a recantation of criticism set forth in passages that we have already noticed. In imperial relations his two principal charges against the democratic government had been judicial and financial exploitation of the allies. In his last play, the Birds, the island-summoner regarded the allies as his most promising field of profitable litigation.¹ And earlier, in the Knights, he had attacked the increase in tribute as one of the evils attendant upon the inter-Hellenic war. It is obvious that reform advocated by such a critic, so far from aggravating the evils criticized, must be intended to alleviate or remove them.

In the interval between the appearance of the Birds and the Lysistrata, a change had been made in the collection of imperial revenue. The tribute had been commuted into a 5 per cent duty on exports and imports, in the hope, says Thucydides, of realizing a larger income.² Beloch correlates this measure with the proposal of Lysistrata and regards the new tax as a mighty stride in the direction of an Einheitsstaat, nothing else than the extension over the greater part of the empire of the system already applied to the cleruchs.³ His conclusion has by no means

W. S. Ferguson, Greek Imperialism (Boston, 1913), pp. 30-31, and CAH, V, 325.

¹Av. 1422-60.

²In Thuc. vi. 91. 7, Alcibiades points out to the Spartans how greatly the occupation of Deceleia will reduce Athenian income from the tribute. The realization of this prophecy is attested by Thucydides in vii. 28.

³Beloch, Attische Politik, pp. 67-68; "Zur Finanzgeschichte Athens," Rheinisches Museum, XXXIX (1884), pp. 43 ff.; and Griech. Gesch., II, Part I (1914), 375. E. Cavaignac (Etudes sur l'histoire financière d'Athènes au Ve siècle [Paris, 1908], p. 148) considers this view probable. J. B. Bury, A History of Greece (2nd ed.;

met with universal acceptance,¹ and he himself admits that the reform, to be sure, made a yawning breach in the sovereign rights of the single states. He even points out that in the so-called Second Confederacy, when a return was made to the old system of collecting revenue, we discern a corresponding reversion to concern for the autonomy of the single states. If the effect of the new duty was, as Beloch asserts, to diminish still further the sovereign rights of the single states, who would be quicker to recognize that fact than the poet who had made himself the spokesman of states' rights? His only reference to the 5 per cent tax is in a charge of treason against Thorycion in the Frogs² where the epithet "collector of the 5 per cent" is probably a synonym for "publican and sinner."³ The effect of the new duty may, indeed,

London, 1913), p. 486, apparently subscribes fully to Beloch's view.

¹Busolt-Swoboda (Staatskunde, II, 1228) affirms that the 5 per cent was introduced also into the kleruchiai, but refers to Max Romstedt (Die wirtschaftliche Organization des athenischen Reiches [Weida, 1914], pp. 44-45) who argues that the impost of this percentage on the cleruchies represents an increase intended to raise their tax as high as that of the allies. Holm (op. cit., II, 483) agrees that "the new tax was paid by the Athenians as well as by the allies," but in regard to Beloch's view that the substitution of the duties for the tribute was a great advance in the direction of unity, he remarks: "If unity could be created by equality of burdens, this view would be correct." Ferguson (CAH, V, 313) says that the change was "invidious because of the exemption undoubtedly granted to Athenians if not to Athenian metics." The language of Thucydides (vii. 28) says specifically that the tax was imposed "upon the subjects."

²Ran. 363. This is the only passage cited as contemporary evidence by those who hold the view that the 5 per cent duty was collected from Athenian cleruchies, and as Van Leeuwen notes: "Nam in Aegina Thorycionem vigesimam collegisse, id apud Aristophanem non legitur; . . . neque credible mihi videtur Athenienses suos ipsorum cives in Aegina degentes tam ingenti portorio vexasse." Gilbert discusses the passage at length (Beiträge, p. 286 ff.) and shows that the language does not necessarily mean any more than: "entfernen soll sich, wer aus Aigina Kriegscontrebande nach Epidauros schmuggelt, dadurch wie Thorykion Landesverrath ühend, mit der Geschicklichkeit und dem Umfange, wie die athenischen Eikostologen in den Bundesstädten den Schmuggel zu betreiben pflegen."

³This is the suggestion of Gilbert (Beiträge, p. 288) who compares the similar use of telones in Eq. 248 as an abusive epithet.

be helpful in explaining the poet's motive and meaning in the figure of Lysistrata, but instead of leading us to interpret the simile as a further suggestion for the development of an Einheitsstaat, it is an additional reason for believing that Aristophanes was weaving the broad outlines of a plan that would insure some measure of harmony between the various units of the empire and leave out that potent cause of friction, infringement on local autonomy.

From the allied point of view, the exchange of their local identity for citizenship in the distant capital would involve certain definite disadvantages.¹ If the Athenian franchise were extended over the whole empire, some system of taxation would be general, whether the cleruchs had formerly paid the 5 per cent tax or not. The fleet would still have to be maintained for common protection, and the other administrative organs of empire had proved themselves costly enough.² Whereas, under the original system, the tribute, satisfactorily assessed by Aristides, had been raised by each state through its own officers,³ in the exercise of its own political functions, in an Einheitsstaat, the

¹Cf. Greenidge, op. cit., p. 202: "The states would not have thanked Athens for the useless gift of her citizenship, and even had representative government been dreamed of, the mere municipal life which it would have left to the cities would have been a poor exchange for the relics of autonomy which they possessed."

²Cf. Vesp. 682-83.

³Ach. 502 ff., 643. According to the scholiast on Ach. 503, Eupolis says in his Poleis that the allied cities were ordered to bring their tribute to Athens at the time of the Great Dionysia. Cf. scholiast on Ach. 377. It was the duty of the hellenotamiae or the "council" to receive it (Thuc. i. 96 and Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. iii. 2). Cf. Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, II, 1132-33; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 24. 3; Sandys' note ad loc. (2nd ed., 1912); and Wilamowitz, A.u.A., II, 205. Athenian collectors (eklogeis) in tribute-collecting ships (Thuc. iii. 19; iv. 50; etc.) were sent out only to collect arrears. Cf. Gilbert, Const. Antig., p. 425, and Harpocration, s.v. "eklogeis." Cf. Eq. 1071 and Van Leeuwen's note ad loc.

collection of the imperial revenue would be farmed at the financial centre of the empire, and there would soon arise all that financial tyranny so notorious in the Roman provinces of a later day.¹

In the judicial field, the Periclean policy of keeping a firm hand on the allies by means of treaties which stipulated that certain kinds of suits must be tried at Athens,² was another way in which autonomy had progressively diminished and sycophancy increased.³ Whatever justification might be alleged for the judicial supremacy of the head of the empire,⁴ the oligarchic treatise on the Athenian constitution shows how it could be used to exploit the allies financially. The author explains how the compulsory use of Athenian courts increased both public and private income at the capital; the increase affected court fees, harbor dues, house rents, the hiring of team or servant, and the employment of heralds.⁵ Alcibiades, in exile at Sparta, publicly recognized

¹Livy xlv. 18 (167 B.C.): "Ubi publicanus esset, ibi aut jus publicum vanum aut libertatem sociis nullam esse." Cf. E. H. Oliver, Roman Economic Conditions to the Close of the Republic (Toronto, 1907), p. 195: "Not to her Italian agriculture, then, nor to her manufactures, nor to her industries or commerce can we attribute the increase in Roman wealth, but to the exploitation of her provinces." This exploitation received its chief impetus from a decree of Gaius Gracchus who enacted that the taxes of Asia should be farmed at Rome. Cf. Th. Mommsen, Römische Geschichte (7th ed.; Berlin, 1881), II, 111 and note.

²This applies particularly to political and criminal cases involving an Athenian and a citizen of an allied state. Moreover, all sentences carrying certain specified penalties had to be confirmed by the Athenian court. Cf. H. Grant Robertson, The Administration of Justice in the Athenian Empire (Toronto, 1924), pp. 46, 54-56; Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 310-15.

³Eq. 838 ff.; Pax 639 ff.; Av. 1430-60; Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. 1. 18; Antiphon v. 74 ff. Cf. J. O. Lofberg, Sycophancy in Athens (Menasha, 1917), pp. 68 ff.; Robertson, op. cit., pp. 80 ff.

⁴Thuc. 1. 77; cf. R. J. Bonner, Class. Phil., XIV (1919), 284 ff.

⁵Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. 1. 16-18.

this income from court fees and pointed out that it would decrease if the Spartans occupied Deceleia, which would make it more difficult for allied litigants to attend Athenian courts.¹ As matters stood, the treaties guaranteed the venue in certain cases to the separate cities, because they were still political entities.² If they became merged in an Einheitsstaat, they would naturally lose all courts except such as had jurisdiction over strictly local matters of minor importance. If in Antiphon's lifetime sentence of death could be passed nowhere but at Athens,³ we may assume that in the Einheitsstaat all criminal cases would be tried in the capital. If all inhabitants of Ionia became Athenian citizens, Athens would naturally be the only legislative centre for the whole enlarged state. Consequently, all constitutional litigation and suits for illegality would be tried there. The same would be true of prosecutions for non-citizenship as well as of disputes between residents of different towns or islands. The resulting increase in court business would greatly aggravate the congestion and delays from which the allies already suffered,⁴ unless there were devised a policy of judicial decentralization

¹Thuc. vi. 91. 7.

²CIA, IV, 1, 27 a; Hicks and Hill, op. cit., No. 40. The decree dealing with Chalcis in 446, sec. 3 says: "There shall be penalties (euthunas) for Chalcidians against their fellow-citizens in Chalcis even as for Athenians in Athens, except the penalties of banishment, death, and atimia. As to these, there shall be a reference (epheis) to Athens to the heliaea of the thesmothetae according to the decree of the people." For euthunas meaning "penalties," cf. Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, II, 1357, n. 4; and Robertson, op. cit., pp. 41-42; and for epheis meaning "reference" cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 230; and Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 314, n. 2. Lipsius, on the contrary, definitely says (op. cit., p. 970) "an appeal was permitted." Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 310 and 312: "In commercial suits Athens provided reciprocity in litigation. . . . Reciprocity was secured by the principle that actio sequitur forum rei."

³Antiphon v. 47; cf. Robertson, op. cit., p. 30; Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 315.

⁴Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. iii. 1,2.

similar to that which Peistratus had employed.¹ Practically, the allied cities would be reduced to the status of demes.² For the empty name of citizens of Athens they would sacrifice what few functions they yet exercised as active members of a self-governing community.

For what reality would the franchise confer upon the Ionians? If in war-worn Attica, devices had to be invented to assemble a quorum in the ecclesia,³ and that too with the population concentrated within the walls, how would it be possible, not to say convenient, for distant islanders to attend meetings of the sovereign people, even though the watery ways should be swept free of foes by the imperial fleet? The same difficulty of distance would render membership in the senate and dicasteries impracticable. If one can judge by the only known precedent, the similar case of the Plataeans enfranchised in 427,⁴ they would certainly be excluded for the first generation from the nine archónships.⁵

It is necessary here to consider the matter of precedent. The treatment of the Plataeans is not a real parallel, inasmuch as they were not enfranchised en bloc. Each Plataean fugitive that desired to avail himself of the grant of Athenian citizenship was required to appear before an Athenian dicastery and prove his nationality and his goodwill to the Athenian people.⁶ We have

¹Aristotle Ath. Pol. 16. 5.

²Gilbert, Const. Antig., pp. 452-53.

³Ach. 22 and scholiast; cf. Thuc. viii. 72. For discussion of quorum, cf. Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 209-16.

⁴Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, II, 945; Lysias xxiii. 2; Isoc. xii. 94; xiv. 13, 52; Ps.-Demos. lix. 104-6. For the interpretation of Thuc. iii. 55, 63 see Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1038, n. 2.

⁵Ps.-Demos. lix. 104, 106.

⁶Ps.-Demos. lix. 105-6.

good reason to believe that they did not all submit to this test, nor all become citizens.¹ The Plataean example did, of course, offer a precedent for the enfranchisement of individual xenoi, as we have pointed out above, but that was an entirely different matter from the wholesale admission of all the citizens of all the Ionian cities. In the latter case the examination of individual credentials in an Athenian court would be a practical impossibility.

There is another important difference between the two cases compared. If the allies should be admitted en masse to the Athenian citizenship, they would continue to live on the islands and in Ionia as before. The Plataeans, on the contrary, had received Athenian citizenship precisely because they had become homeless through their steadfast loyalty to their ally and had, in fact, taken up their residence in Athens.² It is clear that their enfranchisement conformed to the principle laid down long before by Solon of giving citizenship only to those that were likely to become permanent members of the community, since other ties were definitely severed.

When, in 421, the Plataeans were transplanted as Athenian cleruchs to the conquered territory of Scione,³ not even this experiment could have been regarded by Aristophanes as a model for imperial reform. It was not an example of extending Athenian citizenship to another city. It was rather an example of seizing another city for those who were already citizens. And so it aroused the resentment of the critics of imperial oppression.⁴

¹Lysias iii. 33; Busolt, *loc. cit.* Cf. E. Szanto, Das griechische Bürgerrecht (Freiburg, I. B., 1892), p. 101.

²Szanto, Griech. Bürgerrecht, p. 95. Cf. Wilamowitz, Introduction to Aristophanes Lysistrate, p. 52; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1626.

³Thuc. v. 32; Diodorus xii. 76; Isoc. iv. 109. Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1038, n. 2, and 1211.

⁴Isoc. iv. 100; xii. 63.

Aristophanes who, in the Clouds,¹ with Euboea in mind, satirized this kind of confiscation, would share the feelings of those Athenians whom Xenophon describes after the disaster of Aegospotami as sleepless with the thought that they would soon suffer what they had inflicted upon the Melians and Hestiaeans and Scionaeans and many other of the Greeks.² Plutarch adds³ that Lysander's subsequent proceedings in expelling the Athenian cleruchs from Aegina and Melos and Scione were viewed with satisfaction by the Greeks. The italicized words are, no doubt, a true appraisal of the contemporary Panhellenic political conscience,⁴ with which Aristophanes sympathized, since he mentions the cleruch system only with disapproval.⁵

The enfranchisement of the Samians in 405,⁶ though a high reward for unique loyalty in extreme need, and a conspicuous instance of the achievement of unity between Athens and one of her allies, does not, even so late in the twilight of the empire, afford any suggestion of the currency of the conception of an Einheitsstaat. As Szanto has shown,⁷ the decree expressly guarantees autonomy and the use of their own laws to the Samians, a condition which implies isopolity or "constitutional reciprocity" between two sovereign states rather than a sympolity or Einheitsstaat or single supreme state common to the former citizens of

¹Nub. 203-5, 211-13.

²Hell. 11. 2. 3.

³Lysander 14.

⁴Xenophon points to such a conscience when he says (Hell. 11. 2. 23) that the razing of the Long Walls was regarded by the returned exiles as the beginning of freedom for Greece. Cf. Plut. Lysander 15.

⁵Nub. 203-5, 211-13.

⁶Busolt, Staatskunde, I, 225; II (bearb. von Swoboda), 945; CAH, V, 363; IG², II, 1; Hicks and Hill, op. cit., No. 81; M. N. Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford, 1933), No. 96. Cf. Xen. Hell. 11. 2. 6; 11. 3. 6; Plut. Lysander 14.

⁷Griech. Bürgerrecht, pp. 95-96, 159. Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1626.

both. If the Plataeans retained Athenian citizenship when they returned to their city, rebuilt after the Peace of Antalcidas,¹ that connection also would be an isopolity.²

The obscure reference to epigamia by Lysias in his speech On the Constitution has been taken as evidence³ that, previous to 413, Athens did take one significant step towards conferring partial citizenship upon her nearest and most valued ally. "When we possessed our walls and our ships and wealth and allies, so far from contemplating the rejection of any Athenian, we even granted epigamia to Euboeans."⁴ But the definite article is omitted before "Euboeans" and there is nothing in the passage to indicate that the concession applied to the whole of Euboea or to any whole community in Euboea. Athenian cleruchs had been living at various places in the island since the revolt of 447, and we cannot doubt that in many cases they had contracted marriages

¹Paus. ix. 1. 4. Beloch, Griech. Gesch. III, Part I, 105, gives the date of the restoration of Plataea as 382; cf. Xen. Hell. v. 1. 31-33. There is some suggestion that the Plataeans may have retained Athenian citizenship after their return to Plataea in Isoc. xiv. 52.

²Isopolity is defined in Busolt, Staatskunde, I, 223, n. 2, and in Szanto, Griech. Bürgerrecht, pp. 67-71. Sympolity is defined in Busolt, Staatskunde, I, 156, and in Szanto, Griech. Bürgerrecht, p. 104. Olynthus organized a sympolity or Einheitsstaat among the cities of Chalcidice after the Peloponnesian War, which was broken up by Sparta in 379 (Xen. Hell. v. 2. 12, 19; v. 3. 26; Beloch, Griech. Gesch. III, Part I, 101, 106).

³E.g., by Thalheim (Pauly-Wissowa, RE, VI, 62); Lipsius, op. cit., p. 418, n. 159. C. D. Adams (Lysias Selected Speeches [New York, c. 1905], p. 321) seems to imply something of the sort: "As a mark of especial gratitude or friendship Athens sometimes conferred upon individual foreigners, and even upon cities, the privilege of intermarriage. . . . Close connection with Euboea was always of the utmost importance to Athens. The [intermarriage] not only bound the states together but enabled the Athenian cleruchs, who were settled there in large numbers, to intermarry with their neighbors. The sons of such marriage had full Athenian citizenship."

⁴Lysias xxxiv. 3.

with native women who were Ionians like themselves. Much the most probable interpretation of Lysias' statement is given by Hruza¹ who understands it as referring to legislation enfranchising the offspring of such mixed marriages. Not only does this view remove the necessity of assuming a revolutionary extension of the citizenship to a whole territory, but it also harmonizes better with the context. Lysias is arguing against a motion to limit the franchise to landholders. He urges that the exclusion of any class from a share in the constitution undermines the safety of the state which consists in its man power, whether hoplites, cavalry, or archers. His plea is consistently supported if he has reason to state that, in the first democracy, the value of cleruch garrisons was marked by the legal recognition of the sons of cleruchs and foreign mothers, in Euboea at least. That epigamia may be used inexactly for politeia of which it is one of the most important privileges is shown in the Plataeicus² of Isocrates, where he speaks of the gift of epigamia which Hruza³ has shown to be politeia. The value of Lysias' statement to explain the proposal of Aristophanes is the same as we have assigned to those of Andocides when he speaks of making citizens of Thessalians and Andrians. The reference in both cases is to individual xenoi and not to an imperial franchise.

It was one thing for Aristophanes to urge that actual residents of Athens, like the metics, should be admitted to the same franchise as their fellow-residents, but it would be quite

¹Beiträge zur Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Familienrechtes, Vol. II, Polygamie und Pellikat nach griechischen Rechte (Erlangen und Leipzig, 1894), p. 145. Cf. Beauchet, op. cit., I, 211.

²xiv. 51.

³Op. cit., II, 144; cf. Beauchet, op. cit., I, 210.

another thing to suggest that allies who were only occasionally in the capital city would be materially benefited by the right to use Athenian institutions. In their case, the gift of citizenship would be a mere compliment, and little, if any, alleviation of the grievances which were responsible for their defection from Athens. The professed purpose of Lysistrata's reform was to unravel the tangle of the misgoverned empire; to pull the knotted wool apart. Under the democratic imperialists, when an ally had revolted, it had been reduced to subjection, each attempt resulting in a snarl. From a general viewpoint, the fundamental and increasing cause of disaffection was the growth of Athenian control at the expense of allied autonomy.¹ To transform Athenian subjects into Athenian citizens would, perhaps, establish the policy of centralization on a firmer basis, but it could scarcely satisfy the aspirations of separate states for the removal of irksome restrictions. After all, it was imperialism that irked, and Aristophanes was no friend of imperialism. He could not have proposed a remedy designed to perpetuate the existing system even in an improved form.

These a priori considerations are confirmed by a more careful examination of the text. It should be noted that Lysistrata's words are not taking all these wool-flocks, but rather taking the wool-flocks from all these.² It follows, then, that the wool-flock of the city-colonies cannot be their whole citizen body, and the notion of an imperial citizenship is therefore excluded. Neither does a general enfranchisement offer any explanation for the words bring it together here,³ for as we have

¹Cf. Xen. Poroi v. 6.

² $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ ἀπὸ τούτων πάντων τὸ κάταγμα λαβόντας.

³ δεῦρο συάγειν.

pointed out, the allies could not all regularly attend an assembly of the people at Athens, and there could be no question of transferring the population of Ionia to Attica.

Wilamowitz agrees that Aristophanes could not have conceived of an imperial citizenship, for that would have required a completely new constitution. He solves the difficulty by taking "katagma" to mean a selection of the citizens of the cities to whom Athenian citizenship would be extended that they might fill the gaps made by the war in the ranks of the burghers.¹ His solution satisfies the language of our passage, but it receives no confirmation from the parabasis of the Frogs, which, as we have already pointed out, was conceived under similar circumstances, and in which Aristophanes deals with the same problem as in the first half of the present simile and gives a fairly explicit statement of his views on the extension of the franchise. The relevant passage from the Frogs reads: "But relenting from our anger, O wisest by nature, let us willingly win as kinsmen and as fully-franchised citizens all men that fight with us."²

If "all men" in this passage can include allied contingents or whole groups of Ionians fighting on Athenian ships, it lends weighty support to Wilamowitz. But the famous epirrHEMA contains no suggestion that is not adequately explained by reference to the internal politics of Athens. The poet is chiefly desirous of healing the wounds left by the double revolution of 411-410. Freedom had been the reward of the slaves who had fought one battle for Athens at Arginusae.³ A fortiori, he argues, the franchise

¹Introduction to Aristophanes Lysistrata, pp. 51-52.

²Ran. 700-702.

³Ran. 33, 191, 694. According to the scholiast on l. 694, Hellanicus says that the slaves who had fought with the Athenians were freed, registered as Plataeans, and lived as fellow-citizens

should be restored to the veterans of many battles, though they had forfeited it by participation in the oligarchy.¹ Then follow the lines we have quoted, urging the admission of "all men that fight with us." Here, even more plainly than in the words of Lysistrata, andragathia is made the test of eligibility. We know that metics and xenoi served constantly with both the army and the fleet.² What interpretation is more natural than to understand "all men" of the Frogs as referring to the metics and xenoi,³ residents of Athens, who performed the duties and therefore deserved the rights of citizens, and whose enfranchisement had already been advocated in the Lysistrata? In the epirrhemata of the Frogs there is no clear reference to allies or cities or colonies, no suggestion, in fact, that the poet is thinking of the external as opposed to the internal policy of his country.

The chief objection to the solution of Wilamowitz is that it takes no account of the interests and grievances of the allies. His transfusion of new blood from the subject cities to the capital would compensate Athens for her numerical losses, but ignores the vital question of assimilation. There is ground for doubt

with them. It was formerly believed by Thomas Arnold (note on Thuc. i. 55 [1868]), and Kock, Merry, and Blaydes (in notes ad loc.) that, like the Plataeans before them, the slaves were rewarded with some inferior kind of citizenship. We have seen above that the Plataeans had been given full Athenian citizenship in 427 and sent out as cleruchs to Scione in 421. It is probable, therefore, that Hellanicus means that the slaves were enfranchised for gallantry equal to that of the Plataeans, and were settled in Scione as fellow cleruchs with the Plataeans. Cf. Van Leeuwen's note; Gilbert, Const. Antiq., p. 187; Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1038, n. 2.

¹Ran. 687-92, 697-99.

²Thuc. i. 121, 143.

³This is Merry's view, but Rogers thinks that "the whole force of the passage seems to consist in the utter absence of all limit and restriction" (note on Ran. 701), although he is equally certain that "all" of Lys. 579 "means not 'all men' but 'all Athenian citizens'" (note on Lys. 699). Rogers is here more inconsistent than Aristophanes.

that the Plataeans ever became assimilated at Athens.¹ Homogeneous groups of immigrants present a problem of this kind that does not arise in the case of individual xenoi.² An accretion of numbers obtained by the enfranchisement of groups would probably not represent an increase in national strength. But even if the experiment succeeded locally, its consequences in the empire would be disastrous. Athenian influence was generally maintained in the cities by securing there the predominance of the democratic party.³ We have pointed out the result of the change to oligarchy in Thasos and elsewhere in 411. Shortly after the Samian demos was given Athenian citizenship in 405, the democrats were expelled and an oligarchy set up under Spartan authority.⁴ In making a selection of citizens from the allied states the choice would fall upon democrats, and their removal to Athens would leave the oligarchs in the ascendancy,⁵ thereby creating a condition of affairs least conducive to a prolongation of the life of the League, and most inimical to Athenian hegemony.⁶ The selected immigration

¹Lysias (xxiii. 6) says that all the Plataeans in Athens used to resort to the "Green Cheese" on the last day of the month, thus preserving their national consciousness.

²Cf. the trouble which the Doukhobors have always caused the government of Canada.

³Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. i. 14-16; iii. 10; Xen. Hell. iii. 4.7; Isoc. xii. 54; iv. 106. E. M. Walker (CAH, V, Note 4) holds that no other form of government but democracy was tolerated in the subject states, but H. G. Robertson (Class. Phil., XVIII [1933], pp. 50-53) believes that Athens used indirect means such as her political influence and moral suasion to bring about an almost universal prevalence of democracy in her empire.

⁴Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 6-7; Plut. Lysander 14. Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1627, n. 3.

⁵Just as the ascendancy of the oligarchs at Athens in 411 was made possible largely by the democratic seamen being absent in Samos (Thuc. viii. 72). Cf. Bury, op. cit., p. 493.

⁶We learn from Thuc. iii. 47. 2 that revolt originates in the oligarchic faction in the allied cities. Cf. CAH, V, 323, 328, where Ferguson seems to read more into the remarks of Phrynichus (Thuc. viii. 48) than I can find there.

theory apparently offers little advantage to Athens herself, but its most serious drawback is the utter lack of any suggestion for the improvement of inter-imperial relations. The Lysistrata was written in the shadow of the Treaty of Miletus. The allies were seeking to break away from Athenian control.¹ It is inconceivable that the poet who has continued to express a lively interest in their welfare and in Panhellenic unity should have evolved a program of reform which did not contain an article framed to foster that unity before the growing menace from Persia.²

The franchise extension of the first part of the simile was prompted by a desire to remove invidious anomalies in the status of persons who had been welded by common interest and common sacrifice into a comparatively unanimous civic body. The same heroic treatment, however, was not necessary for purging the relations between Athens and her allies of injustice and suspicion. The touchstone of Aristophanes' political criticism was not a vision of the logical development of the imperial system. His criticism was consistently inspired by an ideal picture of the policy of Cimon,³ and the Panhellenic relations of the early days of the Confederacy of Delos. In the Wasps the activities of the

¹The revolt of Chios, Erythrae, Clazomenae, Teos, and Miletus occurred about June 412 (Thuc. viii. 14, 16, 17). The first Treaty of Miletus immediately followed (Thuc. viii. 18). Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1422, 1426. In the Mytilenean debate, Cleon assumes that the allies habitually desired to revolt (Thuc. iii. 39. 7). Diodotus corroborates this by observing that it is natural for a free state, which has been reduced to subjection, to revolt to regain its autonomy (Thuc. iii. 46. 5).

²Cf. CAH, V, 361: "In 407 B.C. Persia became the real adversary of Athens."

³Cf. CAH, V, 61: "Whatever may have been the change in the relative position of Athens and her allies in the course of the first fifteen years of the League's history, there is no reason to suppose that it was due to the policy of Cimon . . . that Cimon himself deliberately aimed at the degradation of the Allies to the position of subjects is certainly not borne out by our evidence." Cf. Plut. Cimon 11.

Panhellenic fleet are described with fond enthusiasm.¹ The name of Cimon carries marked significance in this play.² Every suggestion has led to the conclusion that, in the poet's opinion, the revival of the League in its original form, presided over by the spirit of Cimon, would be a full and sufficient cure for the ills of exploitation so zealously exposed in the Knights and in the Wasps. It becomes necessary, then, to consider whether the advice of Lysistrata to the Probulus cannot be satisfactorily explained on the same basis.

This is Whibley's point of view in saying that Aristophanes "advocated a scheme of imperial federation," and that the words bring it together here and gather it into a unit "can only refer to a common council of the alliance at Athens."³ Croiset seems to agree: "Lysistrata certainly appears desirous of maintaining the maritime confederacy."⁴ Not only of maintaining it, we should

¹Vesp. 236-37, 439-40, 678, 684-85, 1098-1101.

²Lys. 1144.

³Op. cit., p. 100, n. 4. Greenidge (op. cit., p. 202) seems to have the same idea, derived apparently by a misunderstanding from Beloch: "Men of the moderate or middle party seem even to have hinted at the possibility of Imperial Federation. . . it was a last resort, and is well compared by Beloch with the similar proposals for unification which were made at Rome after the battle of Cannae." He refers to Beloch, Attische Politik, p. 67, n. 2. J. Wells ("Aristophanes and Herodotus," Studies in Herodotus [Oxford, 1923], p. 182) mentions "the poet's statesman-like desire to end strife by a federal compromise." Henderson, (op. cit., p. 411) also accepts the view of an Imperial Federation without comment or explanation.

It is pointed out by Bonner and Smith (op. cit., I, 170) that συμῆγορ as used by Solon (if that is the correct restoration of the text in Aristotle Ath. Pol. xii. 4; cf. apparatus criticus in Sandys' second edition, London, 1912) indicates organization as well as assembly.

⁴Op. cit., p. 142. Here again Croiset is not fair to Aristophanes in saying (p. 143): " . . . but the harm had been done, and it was certainly a great delusion to think that it could be made good by a kindly policy while war was in full swing." On the contrary, it is first and foremost always the policy of Aristophanes to achieve peace. The reform of the empire was to follow. Croiset also believes that, "once separated from the

add, but also of correcting some of the abuses that have grown up under statesmen of Cleon's kidney, in whose philosophy empire is identical with despotism and shamelessly founded upon terrorism and force.¹ This desire to revive and reform the quondam symbol of Hellenic co-operation is shown by the unerring penetration with which Aristophanes selects the calling of a federal council as the one most significant step in the abnegation of tyranny. The change of Delian Confederacy into Athenian Empire had been marked both by the removal of the treasury from Delos to Athens and the gradual dwindling of the council and the final cessation of its meetings.² Removal of the centre of administration from the small island to the leading city for reasons of greater efficiency and security commended itself to the judgment of the reformer and with that he has no quarrel. Perhaps the allies regarded the move as reasonable; Theophrastus says that the Samians suggested it.³ But the failure of Athens to call and consult the

metropolis, the cities in question would never have rejoined it of their own free will. The sense of autonomy was too strong. . . ." Cf. Thuc. viii. 48. 5. The reform suggested by Aristophanes was based upon local autonomy. As for rejoining Athens, the Treaty of Miletus showed plainly enough that the cities of Ionia must be protected by a strong naval power and could not exist as isolated units. Athens was their natural protector. The policy of Aristophanes was plain common sense.

¹Thuc. iii. 37. 2; 40. 4; cf. ii. 63. 2. Aristotle Ath. Pol. 2; Eq. 1111-14. Cf. CAH, V, 216: "To the discontent among the Allies Cleon opposed frank terrorism."

²The imperial quota lists begin with the year 454-453 after the treasure had come under the protection of Athena. The removal from Delos is therefore dated in 454. This is about the time that news of the loss of the great Athenian expedition to Egypt became known, and it is plausibly suggested that fear of the Persian fleet provided Athens with an excuse for the removal of the treasure (Plut. Pericles 12 and Holden's note in his edition). Cf. Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 204-5; Cavaignac, op. cit., p. 62; Bury, Op. cit., p. 339; CAH, V, 84, 94.

³Plut. Arist. 25. Wilamowitz doubts the reliability of this allegation of Theophrastus (A.u.A., I, 160, n. 65) but Busolt (G.G., III, Part I, 205, n. 2) and Cavaignac (op. cit., p. 48) believe it to be authentic. Theophrastus also related that

council was a patent arrogation of authority. It was the result of revolt after revolt and the consequent reduction of city after city from the status of autonomous ally to that of dependent subject.¹ The council could therefore be taken as a symbol of autonomy, as well as of co-operation, and Aristophanes fairly fixes upon that as the vital point in the conciliation for which he pleads.

If he is to be credited with any precision of expression, or any consistency of policy, it is obvious that Whibley's interpretation is the correct one. The simile calls for a revival of the confederate council at Athens. The wisdom of the proposal, or rather the proof that Aristophanes was in touch with the most liberal and enlightened political thought of his time, or, if you will, his prophetic clairvoyance is shown in the fact that his words are equally well suited to describe the council of the Second Athenian Confederacy in which an attempt was made to avoid the faults of the first.² From a different point of view, in answer to those who can credit Aristophanes with no political

Aristeides regarded the removal of the treasury to Athens as not just, but expedient. If, as Aristotle reports (Ath. Pol. 24. 1) Aristeides really suggested that Athenians should concentrate in the city and live upon the revenues of their naval hegemony, there is no reason to doubt that he approved of the removal of the treasury. Bonner and Smith (op. cit., I, 227) accept this account of Aristeides' policy. Wilamowitz (A.u.A., I, 159-60) rejects it. The account given in Plutarch (Arist. 24, 25) is inconsistent and contradictory. Whether the idea of a civil list, including pay for jury duty, originated with Aristeides or not, Pericles was responsible for putting it into effect, and commonly got the credit for it (Bonner and Smith, op. cit., I, 227-29), and the traditional character of Aristeides was free from the taint of a desire to exploit the allies.

¹Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 205; Bury, op. cit., p. 339.

²Meyer, op. cit., v³, 381; F. H. Marshall, The Second Athenian Confederacy (Cambridge, 1905), p. 10. Complete autonomy was guaranteed to the members of the Second Confederacy both by the Athenian decree of Aristoteles (CIA, II, 17=Hicks and Hill, op. cit., No. 101) and by the Peace of Antalcidas which was recognized in the decree (Xen. Hell. v. 1. 31; Diod. xiv. 10).

sagacity and regard him as a futile echo of the past, it might be said that he was no more reactionary than those who organized the council of the Second League. And yet, one need not believe that he drew his inspiration wholly from the past. It has been supposed, not unreasonably, that the Second League may have been modeled in one respect at least upon the Boeotian federal constitution,¹ which dated from Athenian withdrawal from Boeotia.² The efficiency of that constitution had been amply demonstrated to Athenian doubters at the Battle of Delium.³ Scattered references throughout the plays to the importance of Boeotian trade,⁴ Boeotian menace to Athenian agriculture⁵ or possibly to Athenian shipping,⁶ conspiracies hatched in Boeotia against the Athenian state,⁷ and, finally, Lysistrata's concern lest all Boeotians perish,⁸ show that Aristophanes was fully aware of the power across the frontier. Lysistrata's plot is a Panhellenic conspiracy which requires the adherence of the noble Ismenia⁹ as well as of the athletic Lampito.¹⁰ We need not labor the point further than to say that the federal system was in successful operation in Boeotia throughout the period in which these plays were written, and that

¹R. J. Bonner, "The Boeotian Federal Constitution," Class. Phil., V (1910), 413, n. 3, says; "Glotz very plausibly suggests (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, XXXII [1908], 272, n. 2) that the Boeotian federal court served as a model for the central court of the second Athenian confederacy." Bonner concludes his article by describing the Boeotians as "the people who were the political schoolmasters of the Athenians" (p. 417).

²447-446. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (London, 1908), V, 225. Cf. Bonner, Class. Phil., V (1910), 414.

³Thuc. iv. 91, 96, 101. The battle was fought in November 424 (Busolt, G.G., III, Part II, 1146-50).

⁴Ach. 624, 721, 872 ff., 900; Pax 1003; Lys. 702; Frag. 364 (Hall and Geldart).

⁵Ach. 1023, 1077.

⁶Ach. 920 ff.

⁷Eq. 479.

⁸Lys. 35.

⁹Lys. 697; cf. 40, 75.

¹⁰Lys. 78 ff.

Aristophanes undoubtedly knew something of it.¹ His scheme for a federal alliance was, therefore, recommended both by the memory of a glorious past and by observation of enemy efficiency in the present. He himself elsewhere remarks:

"Yet to clever folk, a foeman very useful hints may show."²

We are given just sufficient information to indicate the general character of needful reform, and the simile concludes abruptly. The wool-flock from all the colonies is to be brought together in Athens to form a great clew. We have adduced reasons to show that this process must be the assembling of a federal council. The wool-flock from all the colonies must be their delegates, in what manner selected we are not told, but that they are a selection is plain from the partitive force of the prepositional phrase. As Wilamowitz points out, the spinning and weaving are not elaborated.³ We pass without particulars from the distaff to the product of the loom. It is not in keeping with the genius of Aristophanes to concern himself with details once he has made the essential point clear. The function of the Panhellenic poet is to assert a great principle, to arouse those emotions and stimulate those motives which contribute to the salvation of Greece. The plot of the whole play advocates reconciliation between hostile Greek states. But charity begins at home, and in order to understand the appeal with which the simile concludes, we must remember that the audience at this play were celebrating the Lenaea and were by themselves, as the poet said in the Acharnians.⁴ The specific purpose of the simile is to teach them a pointed lesson in setting their own house in order,

¹Cf. Bonner's arguments to prove that Thucydides was familiar with the Boeotian system (Class. Phil., X [1915], 384-85).

²Av. 375.

³Notes on ll. 574-86.

⁴Ach. 504.

in creating a more charitable atmosphere in their own alliance, as a pledge and earnest of the more general reconciliation.

The simile contains a promise as well as a precept. What is good for all Greek states is good for each one of them. The poet does not forget that to win any favor, his reform must be recommended by suitable advantages. And inasmuch as his audience is wholly Athenian, Athens must enjoy her share of the advantages. Aristophanes is not such a visionary altruist as to ask his country, when the allies sue for the coat of autonomy, to give them also the cloak wherewith his fellow-citizens are clothed. Quite on the contrary, he is convinced, and has contended, that the exploitation policy is responsible for the moth-eaten¹ and threadbare condition of the imperial garment. Once again, as in the case of Philocleon,² the reformed democrat, Aristophanes would replace the old coat (tribon) of imperialism, with the new cloak of a federal model and a model confederacy. His is the far-sighted view³ that in the long run democratic interests are best served not by a predatory but by a conciliatory policy, that contented autonomous allies are not only more satisfied but more satisfactory than dependent subjects. This thesis Aristophanes would maintain from two points of view. From the Panhellenic standpoint, a union of autonomous allies would afford less scope for Persian intrigue.⁴ From the Athenian standpoint, the national

¹Lys. 729-30; cf. Xen. Poroï v. 6.

²Vesp. 1131-32.

³The effective exposition of this view in Thucydides shows that it was not without support in Athens at least as early as 427. Diodotus argues: "It is, I think, far more conducive to the maintenance of our dominion, that we should willingly submit to be wronged, than that we should destroy, however justly, those whom we ought not to destroy (Thuc. iii. 47. 5, trans. G. F. Smith). Cf. also Thuc. iii. 46.

⁴Persian diplomacy in the Ionian War aimed at the recovery of Ionia by playing off Greek against Greek (Thuc. viii. 46. 2-4, 56. 2, 57). Sparta paid this price for Persian support in the

income would be greater and more assured,¹ if Athens had no costly revolts to put down, and if, instead of exacting taxes on allied shipping in allied ports, she proved herself the deserving recipient of voluntary contributions, whether called phoros² or syntaxis.³ The allies had willingly⁴ paid what Aristides had assessed, and under that arrangement Athens had prospered.⁵

Treaty of Miletus (Thuc. viii. 18. 1). But Spartan naval intervention was brought about by the appeals of revolting allies of Athens: Euboea, Lesbos, and Chios (Thuc. viii. 5). The latter could have had no desire to revolt if they could have been confident of autonomy. (So said the Mytilenaeans at Olympia in 428. Thuc. iii. 10. 4, 11. 1.) Hence, the truly Panhellenic policy would have been the preservation of the Athenian confederacy on terms of equality, which would have given the Spartans no justification for a crusade for freedom (Thuc. viii. 46. 3, 52) and given Persia no pawns to set at variance for her own advantage.

¹Cleon (Thuc. iii. 39. 8) and Diodotus (Thuc. iii. 46. 3-4) both agree that Athens would gain if the allies did not revolt, and waste the resources of themselves and Athens in the struggle. On the other hand, the Mytilenaeans victims allege that Athens gained by reducing her allies to the status of subjects (Thuc. iii. 13. 6). A. B. West ("The Tribute Lists and the Non-tributary Members of the Delian League," Amer. Hist. Rev., XXXV [1929-30], 267-75) has shown that there was an increase of tribute-paying allies in the assessment period of 449-446, which showed the effect of Cimon's return from exile and a brief renewal of his Panhellenic policy after the coercive policy of Peisicles' imperialism.

²Thuc. i. 96.

³Harpocration s.v. "syntaxis." Cf. Marshall, op. cit., p. 38: "The name was due to the statesman Kallistratos, who rightly judged that the word phoros would be distasteful to the members of the new Confederacy."

⁴Plut. Arist. 24. In the Peace of Nicias, the assessment of Aristides is used as a fair model for the estimate of the tribute (Thuc. v. 18). Cf. Ps.-Andoc. iv. 11; Diodorus xi. 47; Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 77; Busolt-Swoboda, Staatskunde, II, 1342.

⁵The amount of accumulated treasure on the Acropolis, which may be taken as a barometer of Athenian prosperity, reached its maximum at the value of 9,700 talents (Thuc. ii. 13). Cf. W. S. Ferguson, "Athenian War Finance," Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc., LXIV (1930-32), 347-63: "We are told by Thucydides that at a date determinable at ca. 450 B.C. Athens had accumulated a surplus of 9,700 talents. . . . Since all the tribute put together for the twenty-seven years which had then elapsed since the founding of the Delian League in 478/7 B.C. amounted to less than 11,000 talents, this surplus cannot have been accumulated from the contributions of the allies alone. . . . Its accumulation was a feat of which few governments have been capable. To mobilize for

In keeping with the terms of the simile, the promised prosperity which is to result from a reformed confederacy is indicated in the figurative direction: from it weave a cloak for the Demos. Both nouns are significant, but their full meaning here will only be appreciated in the light of their use elsewhere in Aristophanes.

In the classical period, when the Greek costume had become uniform to some extent,¹ the two principal articles of dress were the chiton which was slipped on, and the himation which was wrapped round.² Physical activity made it necessary to lay aside the himation, and the wearer of the chiton was then described as lightly-clad.³ By contrast, the mark of leisure, culture, and affluence was recognized in the correct manner of wearing the himation.⁴ But the word himation is of comparatively late occurrence.⁵ In Homer, the outer garment is perhaps most commonly that called chlaina which is described as very thick, a protection from the wind, and having a thick nap of wool upon it.⁶ This description

war insurance a sum equal to the entire national wealth is hard to parallel; yet this is what the Athenian democracy accomplished."

¹Thuc. 1. 6; W. A. Becker, Charicles, trans. Frederick Metcalfe (3d ed.; London, 1866), p. 414. Cf. H. Blümner, The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, trans. Alice Zimmern (New York, 1893), p. 12: "According to Thucydides, it was at Sparta that it first became customary to adopt a uniform dress for the whole male population and thus to do away with a distinction which had hitherto prevailed between the dress of poor and rich."

²Becker, op. cit., pp. 413, 418.

³Ecc1. 409-10; Nub. 964, 987; Lys. 150-51. Cf. Becker, op. cit., p. 298.

⁴Plato Theaetetus 175; Av. 1567-68. Cf. Becker, op. cit., p. 419; Ethel B. Abrahams, Greek Dress (London, 1908), p. 54.

⁵It occurs first in Hipponax (fl. ca. 546 B.C.). Franz Studniczka, Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht (Wien, 1886), p. 76, n. 17. Cf. Blümner, op. cit., p. 3: "The word himation is not found in the Homeric period, but the cloak which is worn over the chiton is called chlaina."

⁶Il. x. 134; Od. xiv. 529; Studniczka, op. cit., p. 73.

corresponds exactly to that of the chlaina in Aristophanes. In one instance, he seems to use the word as a synonym for himation.¹ More commonly its connotation is that of a warm, comfortable, woollen protection against winter.² It is associated with the names of other articles of luxury.³ Indeed the word itself, from its meaning of the better type of garment, has acquired the proverbial sense of the better class of citizen, and in the Frogs, Aeschylus makes it a political metaphor. When told that Athens detests statesmen of the better class, and is forced to employ the worse, although it delights not in them either, Aeschylus exclaims: "Then how could anyone save such a city which neither the chlaina nor the sisyra fits?"⁴ The most illuminating passage is that already referred to in the Wasps, where, by his son's directions, the disillusioned, but stubborn Philocleon is compelled to exchange the old tribon, which has been his covering in hardship, for the new, costly, and imported chlaina which seems to him to have consumed a talent of wool and to be so warm that he will soon be roasted alive.⁵ The new garment of luxury and comfort is conferred upon Philocleon as the reward for his conversion from slavery to the demagogues, and as attire suitable for his association with gentlemen.⁶ Again, in the historical reminiscences at the close of the Lysistrata,⁷ the heroine recalls how the Spartans freed the Athenian Demos from slavery to the tyrant Hippias, and clothed it metaphorically in the chlaina to mark its return to freedom and independence.⁸ There is some evidence in Aristophanes

¹Cf. Eccl. 507 and 512.

²Ach. 845; Vesp. 738; Av. 493, 712, 715, 1090; Eccl. 416.

³Thesm. 142; Eccl. 606.

⁴Ran. 1458-59.

⁵Vesp. 1122-56.

⁶Vesp. 1256.

⁷Lys. 1149-56.

⁸In this passage (Lys. 1150-56) the chlaina probably refers to the luxurious dress worn by prosperous Athenians of the older days referred to in Thuc. i. 6. The katonake, a rustic or

that the newer word himation was displacing the older chlaina,¹ but it is more significant that he uses himation usually as the generic term for the outer garment and associates with the chlaina certain attributes such as warmth, comfort, well-being, luxury. It is contrasted with poorer garments such as the tribon,² sisyra,³ and katonake.⁴ In the two principal passages discussed above, where the chlaina is bestowed as a blessing, it becomes the symbol of the poet's approval. His approval of the old-fashioned costume is even more marked in the Knights, where the reappearance and metamorphosis of Demos is hailed with glad acclaim:

See, see where he stands, no vote in his hands, but the
golden cicala his hair in,
All splendid and fragrant with peace and with myrrh, and
the grand old apparel he's wearing!⁵

To Aristophanes, the "grand old apparel" is symbolic of the statesmanship of Aristides, and the generalship of Miltiades, and the victory of Marathon, and the Panhellenic ideal.⁶ If Studniczka⁷ is right in guessing that it was last worn by the followers of Thucydides the son of Milesias, and that they were compelled to abandon it by the scorn and mockery of the victorious democracy, that would be an additional reason for the poet's approval. Aristophanes admired Thucydides and deplored his political ruin⁸ which resulted from his taking issue with Pericles

servile garment, may well suggest the policy of Peisistratus to keep the population on the land as much as possible and to prevent them from congregating in the city (Aristotle Ath. Pol. 16).

¹Himation occurs twenty times in Aristophanes, of which six occurrences are in his latest play, the Plutus, 388 B.C. Chlaina occurs fourteen times in Aristophanes, but does not occur at all in the Plutus.

²Vesp. 1131.

³Ran. 1459.

⁴Lys. 1155-56.

⁵Eq. 1331-32, trans. Rogers.

⁶Eq. 1325, 1334.

⁷Studniczka, op. cit., pp. 25, 26.

⁸Ach. 703-712; Vesp. 947. In spite of the scholiast on Vesp. 941 (Dindorf), it seems improbable that Aristophanes refers

over the use of the tribute and the exploitation of the allies.¹ As an inference, therefore, from the special connotation of chlaina in Aristophanes, is it not reasonable to suppose that in the simile before us, the cloak for the people represents the national prosperity? And as the cloak is to be woven from the clew of wool-flocks, the prosperity must proceed from the renewed federal relationships between Athens and her allies.

The appeal of the argument is to the people of Athens. It is to the Demos that the cloak of prosperity is promised, but not to the imperialist democracy. The essence of Lysistrata's plan is the negation of imperialism, and the restoration of confederation. It would not make sense in this simile, therefore, to interpret Demos as it was understood since the people had given themselves up to the leadership of the great demagogues. That was a decadent and degenerate Demos, a pampered and a parasitic people. Aristophanes lived among them but was not of them. Their ideals were not his ideals nor their ambitions, his ambitions. He identified himself with an older, nobler, and less extreme type of democracy. His catch-words are Aristeides,² Miltiades,

to the ostracism of Thucydides in these passages, because Ach. 703-12 clearly indicate an old man far beyond the capacity of his prime. Ostracism was voted in the assembly not the courts. The reference is probably to a trial after his return from exile. Cf. Starkie, note on Vesp. 947.

¹Plut. Per. 11, 12, 14; Aristotle Ath. Pol. 28; Busolt, G.G., III, Part I, 442, 490-9; CAH, V, 166-68.

²The context in which Aristeides is mentioned in the Knights shows that to Aristophanes, who was born after his death, his name represented not the inventor of the idea of imperial exploitation (Aristotle Ath. Pol. 24. 1; Plut. Arist. 25) but the assessor of the fair and satisfactory tribute (Plut. Arist. 24; Thuc. v. 18. 5) and the man who refused to betray Greece to Mardonius and "carried a motion that the priests should imprecate curses on any one who had dealings with the Persians or deserted the Greek alliance" (Plut. Arist. 10). The traditional reputation of Aristeides is illustrated by Plato Gorgias 526 B; Ps.-Andoc. iv.11; Aeschines iii. 258; Demos. xxiii. 209; Diodorus xi. 47; and the anecdote related in Plut. Arist. 3. Cf. Wilamowitz, A.u.A., I, 160.

and Marathon. He himself has drawn the contrast for us in the Knights, a play which might justly bear the sub-title: A Study of Demos. To understand Aristophanes, one needs to read more Aristophanes. He is his own exegete. The Demos of his ideal plan is not the corrupt creature of Cleon in the first part of the Knights, but the royal figure of its concluding climax. In the Wasps, which is a similar study of democracy from the judicial angle, the converted Philocleon in his luxurious cloak is a fainter, much fainter shadow of the same royal figure. We may safely assume that the cloak of the Lysistrata, which is the same garment as the cloak of the Wasps, is intended to replace a tribon just as worn as that of the Wasps. The old coat of imperialism was more ragged in 412 than it had been in 422. Some of its warmest wool-flocks had been plucked out of late; notably the Chian and Milesian flocks of the finest texture. Athens had great need of a chlaina, of a revival of prosperity, of a new policy towards her allies. But even in the crisis of 412, when Athenian fortunes were at such a low ebb, and when, as Aristophanes realized, the agents of oligarchic intrigue, after a long submersion, at last had some hope of boarding the ship of state, he did not swerve from his allegiance to the characteristic form of Athenian polity. Aristophanes was no propagandist for oligarchy. The word Demos is significant. It is the poet's ideal Demos, but it is the Demos still.

From this discussion of the second half of the simile, there emerge in conclusion two major aspects of the reform by which Aristophanes thought that wise leadership would transform Athenian policy toward her allies or colonies. In the first place the inveterate practice¹ of turning voluntary allies into unwilling

¹Cf. West, Amer. Hist. Rev., XXXV (1929-30), p. 272:
"Furthermore, the lawsuits brought against the allies, and the

subjects must be completely reversed and replaced by the rehabilitation of the old League upon the basis of autonomous alliance. In other words, the attitude of Athens to the allies must be that expressed by the term hegemony, rather than empire. In the second place, the proposition of hegemony involved a corollary. In earlier plays,¹ Aristophanes assumed that the moderate and original tribute as assessed by Aristides was a necessary and just remuneration to Athens for naval protection of the allies. The cloak for the people, therefore, represents the kind of prosperity which prevailed at Athens in the hey-day of the Delian Confederacy, when Cimon led the confederate fleet to new victories, when the allies were glad to pay for the support of that fleet, but before Pericles and his successors had begun to exploit them, or before Athenian ambition had begun to menace the rest of Greece. That prosperity and wealth was recruited from various sources. It might derive in part from reprisals against Persia and the collection of booty as at Eurymedon.² More particularly, it would be the result of trade expansion as the fleet kept the sea free from enemies and pirates and brought new territory into contact with allied commerce. This advantage, in due proportion, would accrue to each member of the League as well as to Athens. But it

penalties imposed upon them, because of failure to take their part in frequent expeditions, the practice superseded when Cimon's suggestion [of commuting contributions of ships into contributions of money] was adopted, are quite what we should expect when Pericles was giving his attention to empire building. In fine, since Cimon was responsible for the reaction favorable to the allies, and since the Persian expedition designed partially to placate them, was possible only after his return from ostracism, we must infer that Cimon's involuntary absence, by making it impossible for him to use his influence for the allied cities, provided the occasion for coercive measures and that his return to public life was followed by the conciliatory measures we have been discussing."

¹Eq. 1065-66, 1079, 1366-67; Vesp. 684-85, 1098-1101.

²Thuc. i. 100; Plut. Cimon 12-13; Diodorus xi. 60-62. Cf. CAH, V, 54-56.

was not to be forgotten that all these benefits depended upon the efficiency of the fleet, and that in turn depended upon the tribute. Such is the design that Aristophanes wove into the pattern of his simile, and that Lysistrata exhibited to the uncomprehending Probulus. Finally, it should not be overlooked that the whole plan of reform is contingent upon the conclusion of peace. Lysistrata's first step is to bring about a cessation of hostilities through the regular diplomatic channels.¹ The plan of the simile is to follow reconciliation.

¹Lys. 569-70.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Select List of Modern Authorities

- Beauchet, Ludovic. Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne. 4 vols. Paris, 1897.
- Becker, W. A. Charicles, or Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. Translated by the Rev. Frederick Metcalfe. 3d ed. London, 1866.
- Beloch, K. J. Die attische Politik seit Pericles. Leipzig, 1884.
- . Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt. Leipzig, 1886.
- . Griechische Geschichte. Zweite neugestaltete Auflage. Vol. II. Strassburg, 1913-14. Vol. III. Berlin und Leipzig, 1922-23.
- . "Zur Finanzgeschichte Athens," Rheinisches Museum, XXXIX (1884), 34-64, 239-59.
- Blass, Friedrich. Die attische Beredsamkeit. 2. Aufl. 3 vols. in 4. Leipzig, 1887-98.
- Blümner, H. The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks. Translated by Alice Zimmern. New York, 1893.
- Böckh, August. Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener. Dritte Auflage herausgegeben und mit anmerkungen begleitet von Max Fränkel. 2 vols. Berlin, 1886.
- Bonner, Robert J. "The Boeotian Federal Constitution," Classical Philology, V (1910), 405-17.
- . "The Four Senates of the Boeotians," Classical Philology, X (1915), 381-85.
- and Smith, Gertrude. The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle. Vol. I. Chicago, 1930.
- Bury, J. B. A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. 2nd ed. London, 1913.
- Busolt, Georg. Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia. 3 vols. in 4. Gotha, 1893-1904. Cited as G.G.
- . Griechische Staatskunde. Erste Hälfte. München, 1920. Zweite Hälfte bearbeitet von Heinrich Swoboda. München, 1926.
- Calhoun, George Miller. Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation. "Bulletin of the University of Texas," No. 262. "Humanistic

- Series," No. 14. Austin, 1913.
- Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. V. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. New York, 1927. Cited as CAH.
- Cavaignac, E. *Études sur l'histoire financière d'Athènes au Ve siècle; le trésor d'Athènes de 480 à 404.* Paris, 1908.
- Clerc, Michel. *Les métèques athéniens.* Paris, 1893.
- Couat, A. *Aristophane et l'ancienne comédie attique.* Troisième édition. Paris, 1902.
- Croiset, Maurice. *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens.* Translated by Jas. Loeb. London, 1909.
- Dahms, Rudolphus. *De Atheniensium sociorum tributis quaestiones septem.* Berlin, 1904.
- Diller, Aubrey. "The Decree of Demophilus, 346-345 B.C.," *Transactions of the American Philological Society*, LXIII (1932), 193-205.
- Dunbar, Henry. *A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes.* Oxford, 1883.
- Ferguson, William Scott. "Athenian War Finance," *Proceedings Massachusetts Historical Society*, LXIV (1930-32), 347-63.
- _____. *Greek Imperialism.* Boston, 1913.
- _____. *The Treasurers of Athena.* Cambridge, Mass., 1932.
- Gilbert, Gustav. *Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Peloponnesischen Krieges.* Leipzig, 1877.
- _____. *The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens.* Translated by E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin. London, 1895.
- Gomme, A. W. "Two Problems of Athenian Citizenship Law," *Classical Philology*, XXIX (1934), 123-40.
- Greenidge, A. H. J. *A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History.* London, 1896.
- Grundy, G. B. *Thucydides and the History of His Age.* London, 1911.
- Henderson, Bernard W. *The Great War between Athens and Sparta, a Companion to the Military History of Thucydides.* London, 1927.
- Hicks, E. L. and Hill, G. F. *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* New and revised edition. Oxford, 1901.
- Holden, Hubert A. *Onomastikon Aristophaneum.* Editio altera. Cambridge, 1902.
- Holm, Adolf. *The History of Greece from its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation.* Translation

- revised by Frederick Clarke. 4 vols. London, 1894-98.
- Jebb, R. C. The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London, 1893.
- Keil, Bruno. "Das System des Kleisthenischen Staatskalendars," Hermes, XXIX (1894), 321-72.
- Lipsius, Justus Hermann. Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren. Leipzig, 1905-15.
- Lofberg, John Oscar. Sycophancy in Athens. Menasha, 1917.
- Marshall, F. H. The Second Athenian Confederacy. "Cambridge Historical Essays," No. XIII. Cambridge, 1905.
- Meyer, Eduard. Geschichte des Altertums. Vol. IV², 1915; Vol. V³, 1921. Stuttgart und Berlin.
- Müller-Strübing, Hermann. Aristophanes und die historische Kritik. Leipzig, 1873.
- Murray, Gilbert. Aristophanes; A Study. Oxford, 1933.
- Norwood, Gilbert. Greek Comedy. London, 1931.
- Robertson, H. Grant. The Administration of Justice in the Athenian Empire. "University of Toronto Studies in History and Economics," Vol. IV, No. 1. Toronto, 1924.
- Schaefer, Arnold. Demosthenes und seine Zeit. Zweite revidierte Ausgabe. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1885-87.
- Schmid, Wilhelm und Stählin, Otto. Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Erster Teil: Die klassische Periode. 2 vols. München, 1929-34.
- Schoell, Rudolf. "De extraordinariis quibusdam magistratibus Atheniensium," Commentationes philologiae in honorem T. Mommseni. Berolini, 1877.
- Studniczka, Franz. Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht. Wien, 1886.
- Swoboda, Heinrich. "Zur Geschichte der attischen Kleruchien," Serta Harteliana, pp. 28-32. Wien, 1896.
- Szanto, Emil. Das griechische Bürgerrecht. Freiburg, I.B., 1892.
- _____. Untersuchungen über das attische Bürgerrecht. Wien, 1881.
- Wells, Joseph. "Aristophanes and Herodotus," Studies in Herodotus. Oxford, 1923.
- West, A. B. "The Aristidean Tribute in the Assessment of 421 B.C.," American Journal of Archaeology, XXIX (1925), 135-51.
- _____. "Cleon's Assessment and the Athenian Budget," Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXI (1930), 217-39.

- West, A. B. "The Tribute Lists and the Non-tributary Members of the Delian League," *American Historical Review*, XXXV (1929-30), 267-75.
- Whibley, L. *Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*. "Cambridge Historical Essays," No. 1. 2nd. ed. Cambridge, 1889.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von. *Aristoteles und Athen*. 2 vols. in 1. Berlin, 1893. Cited as A.u.A.
- _____. "Demotica der attischen Metöken," *Hermes*, XXII (1887), 107-28, 211-59.

